



Christian Order

OCT 26 1978

A Summary of Contents for October, 1978

- ON ECCLESIOLOGY? *Rev. Prof. Dr. J. P. M. v. d. Ploeg, O.P.*
- ER H. E. G. ROPE *Ronald Warwick*
- ATED SOVIET CITIZENS :
N'S FINAL SOLUTION *Czeslaw Jesman*
- RS TO LUCIFER : 6 *R. S.*
- HRISTIAN ESCHATON *Henry Edwards*
- ORGOTTEN FACTOR :
EART OF THE MATTER *The Editor*

WANT TO IMPROVE CATHOLIC EDUCATION ?

LET MANRESA EDUCATIONAL CORPORATION HELP YOU !

The MANRESA EDUCATIONAL CORPORATION is an association of Roman Catholic clergy, Religious, and laity dedicated to the promotion and renewal of Catholic education.

We seek to stimulate and support effective efforts to revitalize truly Catholic education characterized by unqualified commitment to the doctrinal and moral teaching of the Church as officially set forth by its Magisterium of Bishops and Holy See, combined with emphasis on academic excellence and a personal concern for students' welfare and development and their motivation to work for a more fully Christian society.

To this end we founded Cardinal Newman College just outside St. Louis, Missouri. It is now fully operational and functioning on its own. So you see, MANRESA doesn't just lament trends away from orthodoxy and excellence . . . it DOES something about it !

We next founded the MANRESA NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION which publishes the *Manresa Educational Bulletin*. While based in the United States, we have member-subscribers in Canada, England and Belgium, but we hope for truly world-wide coverage and welcome comments and observations from abroad.

If you share our concern and wish to help in this cause so vital to the spiritual and intellectual welfare of our youth and the Catholic Church, please write NOW—before you forget—for further information on how we can work together.

**MANRESA needs YOU . . . and you, as an orthodox
Catholic, need MANRESA !**

Manresa Educational Corporation

**4753 N. Broadway-Suite 900, Chicago, IL 60640,
U.S.A.**

Rev. Raymond V. Schoder, S.J., Ph.D., President

Rev. Christopher J. O'Toole, C.S.C., Ph.D., Vice-President

Contents

THE MEANING OF DIGNITY
The Editor

FATHER H. E. G. ROPE
Ronald Warwick

A NEW ECCLESIOLOGY?
*Rev. Prof. Dr. J. P. M. v.d
Ploeg, O.P.*

LETTERS TO LUCIFER: 6 *R. S.*

LIBERATED SOVIET
CITIZENS: BRITAIN'S
FINAL SOLUTION *Czeslaw Jesman*

THE FORGOTTEN FACTOR:
THE HEART OF THE
MATTER *The Editor*

THE CHRISTIAN
ESCHATON *Henry Edwards*

TEACHING — THEN AND
NOW *Ellen Murray*

ANY QUESTIONS
William Lawson, S.J.

BOOK REVIEW
Rev. Francis Moss

You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.— £4.00, U.S. \$8.00
Australia — £4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand—£4.50, N.Z. \$8.00

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 19

OCTOBER, 1978

NUMBER 10

The Meaning of Dignity

THE EDITOR

WHAT lies at man's heart is his dignity. The sentence sounds fine in itself; but what precisely does it mean? Wherein does man's dignity lie?

It lies in this; that man is more like God than any other visibly created being; and this likeness is found in his possession of powers that flow from his soul and that no other section of God's non-human creation possesses. The powers are those of understanding and will. With them man's existence is no longer at the mercy of events. He is by definition a self-mover, meant to move himself forward through life within the framework of God's law; himself taking responsibility for the actions which are his as a human being, destined by his very nature to take charge, under God, of his own life; never meant to be set at the service—still less to be used as the tool—of another. His dignity, which flows from his humanity, forbids it. His value is absolute, in himself; never to be thought of as relative; gauged, that is, in terms of his contribution to the community he serves, Party, or Ruling Power. Man must never be used, however lightly, as an instrument. To take him that way is to insult him and, with him, the God who made him and endowed him with the dignity that makes him of supreme value, not for what he can do, but simply by reason of what he is in himself.

The essential crime of Communism lies in its denial of man as of absolute value in himself. Embedded in its

thought, and expressed in its soul-killing system are the words of one of its earlier leaders: "Man of and by himself is of no value. He is of value only to the extent that he serves the collective". Communism rates man as no more than an instrument. It is this that I find so utterly repellent. Everything in him—no matter how personal or how precious—has to go if it crosses the Party's will. So much so that the only thing he can have as precious or personal in his life, if he wishes to be a good party member, is the party's will. In other words, his humanity has to go from him, if he would serve the Communist cause. To be true to it he must renounce himself, turn himself into a conditioned zombie and nothing more. It is this that I find so repulsive. And not only I, but those millions of others for whom love and friendship and freedom are the most precious things that there are on this earth. Communism will crack—is cracking now—precisely because its ugly way of life forbids its followers to cherish—as they have every right to cherish—the only things that matter in life beyond all else. I do not give it many more years.

No more, however, do I see western capitalism as offering any kind of valid and viable alternative. Denial of dignity may not be intrinsic to its system; but over and over again it has shown this denial, in practice, as its near-inevitable and ugly and degrading by-product. Let there be no mistake about this. In practice, I sometimes wonder how much there is to choose between the dull demoralization at forty of the worker in the West and his counterpart in a Moscow factory. In theory, yes; but, in actual fact, how much is there to choose between the two?

The thought is worth reflection. The conclusion, I believe, is certain. The denial of dignity which is intrinsic to communist belief and practice can only be overcome when we are upholding, at no matter what cost to ourselves, is all that we in the West have come to care for. There is a long way to go; a hard hill to climb. But each one, when you come to think of it, could start with his neighbour tomorrow. For it is deeds that count in this matter; the little things that mean so much when, for God's sake, we try to make others for the human beings that they are and treat them accordingly. That done, the words can take care of themselves.

Father H. E. G. Rope : Witness for Continuity

RONALD WARWICK

“THERE is nothing more precious” writes Bossuet, than a long life, “that is used as a preparation for eternity”. Father Henry Edward George Rope, who died on St. David’s day 1978, provides a striking illustration of this maxim. He was born in Shrewsbury on October 23, 1880. His father was a surgeon and a devout Anglican. If you visit the church of St. Mary in Shrewsbury in which there stands a memorial to Dr. Rope, it is not difficult to understand Father Rope’s abiding love of English gothic architecture and the faith and civilization that created it. He writes of himself :

The blindness of a jealous love
Had seal’d mine eyes and shut mine heart
To all but mediaeval art
Tho’ oft for justice reason strove.

The Puginesque enthusiasm that was later to lead him to wander,

By Chartres, the city silver-grey
Amid the tawny plains of Beauce;
Or sought the houses huddled close
Beneath the daring of Beauvais

finds eloquent expression in his numerous volumes of poetry and in his book on Pugin.

This feeling for architectural form must have been strengthened when Henry Rope left Shrewsbury School and went up to Christ Church, Oxford—an Oxford that was still essentially that of Arnold’s scholar-gipsy, who turned to watch “The line of festal light in Christ-Church hall”. In 1905, he went to Germany and taught for two years at the University of Breslau. It was while he was at Breslau that Henry Rope was received into the Church, his mother having converted some years earlier. Some of the feeling

f exultation at having found his true home is expressed in his poem "Corpus Christi", written in Breslau in 1906.

After working for two years on the editorial staff of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, he began his studies for the priesthood at the Venerable English College in Rome, and was ordained on February 27, 1915. The remainder of his life was devoted to the service of the Church, both in his own diocese of Shrewsbury, and as archivist to the English College in Rome.

Father Rope was an integral Catholic—a description that has today acquired pejorative implications, such is the potency of the new religion. To his own contemporaries his convictions were frequently unpalatable, to our contemporaries they have become unthinkable. In 1931, Father Rope wrote a book entitled, *Matthew Parker's Witness against Continuity*, in which, with a formidable array of learning and wit, he refutes Anglo-Catholic claims. He writes: "Benoticed, Anglican continuitarians' never vouchsafe to explain when and where Blessed Thomas More, by turning apapist, changed his religion, which, in view of the fact that he was put to death for refusing to change it, is not altogether astonishing". In his latter years, Father Rope, himself became a witness *for* continuity, the continuity between those who today defend the traditional and unchanging Church, and our Catholic forebears. He belonged to that rapidly diminishing number who can remember the time when men revered tradition and were sceptical of novelty. Father Rope never capitulated before the inversion that took place in his own lifetime; "Fashion contradicts tradition. *Modus locutus est. Causa finita est.* Tradition obligingly dies. Only—it doesn't".

Father Rope's astonishment at man's credulity in the face of what passes for progress was derived from his rootedness in English Catholic tradition. Confronted with the injustice and the brutality of the modern world, his is the indignation of a Langland, or of a St. Thomas More who described the enclosure of the common land as "sheep eating men", an indignation which, despite the ruthless oppression of the true Faith, still finds a voice in Cobbett, and is gloriously revived in Chesterton, Belloc and Father McNabb. Father Rope believed in "distributism", which

he described as a "wretched name that steered a course between the Scylla of high finance and the Charybdis of state domination. Properly understood, it is the antithesis of Marxist-based theories, since, as Father Rope put it, "Political freedom without economic freedom is an utter delusion". It is a false notion of progress that leads men to rebel against the Catholic order, and that carries them daily further away from this noble ideal. He writes, in his delightful volume of essays, *Forgotten England*: "There was once a preacher—in Ireland, men say—who expounded the parable of the Gadarene swine. 'Ah! my friends', he proceeded, 'if some of you had been present, you would have held up your hands and exclaimed 'what magnificent progress!' They are gone whom it carried. God send them a fair journey and a better philosophy! For me the fellowship of the lost legion of foot-farers, rich in immortal names including Lionel Johnson's who sang the joy of walking a wild west land, with the winds my fellowship, the company of Borrow and Stevenson and, better still Belloc, *clarem et venerabile nomen*'".

Father Rope's distributism, as well as his robust and devotional Catholicism led him into the company of Chesterton and Belloc, and into the latter's friendship. He paid many happy visits to Kings Land and was often a guest at Christmas—those Christmases so memorably described by Belloc in *A Remaining Christmas*. Father Rope would offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in Belloc's private oratory as he focal point of those Gargantuan festivities.

"*Nihil tetigit quod non desecravit*" was Father Rope's pithy characterisation of the modern spirit "before the war called *Zeitgeist*". It is not therefore surprising that his reaction to the destroyers at work in the "post-Conciliar Church" was one of unequivocal rejection.

Let none deprive us of one hallowed word
of

The Mass for which our martyrs died

The Liturgy so long, so lately ours,

Of which men blinded would Christ's flock bereave.

His spirited defense in the *Catholic Gazette* (which he edited) of Dr. Fahy's *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World* in 1935 shows his acute awareness of the

infiltration by a fifth column into the Church, the effects of which are today obvious. He detested the spinelessness of Church leaders who were mesmerized by amateur sociology and culturally captivated by suburbia. He was astonished that the Catholic priesthood of the world should, like so many Vicars of Bray, subordinate the truth to pragmatic considerations. But, despite this, his faith remained firm to the end, fortified by his daily Mass, his office and the rosary. His conversation was invariably edifying and entertaining. His greatest wish was to see a Church in London where the traditional Mass would again be offered and the authentic Faith taught. Unfortunately for us who remain, *Dis aliter visum*.

Thus to Thy grace of consolation make
Thy choristers of nature sweet response,
Too brief for fond attachment, yet with might
To steel us for the quick-returning hour
When o'er the landscape of our soul shall loom
The winter shadow of the saving Cross.

If we use Eliot's celebrated distinction between religious poetry and devotional verse, I think that we may confidently assign Father Rope's writing to the former category. His intense visual imagination elevates personal apprehension—be it of the towers of Medieval Europe or of his beloved Shropshire—to the level of profound religious experience. His own taste in poetry was for Heine and Rilke, although he also admired the poetry of the French Renaissance. I recall him reciting (not without some irony towards himself), Ronsard's immoral sonnet, "*Quand vous serez bien vieille, au Soir a la chandelle*". His own poetry, however, is in the manner of Alice Meynell, Canon Gray or Lord Alfred Douglas—essentially a part of that turn of the century flowering of English Catholic poetry.

Those of us who have had the fortune to share some of Father Rope's good fellowship, his wit, erudition, deep piety and unfailing charity, will carry it to the end of our days and feel incalculably the better for it.

We are privileged to publish this month from the pen of one of Europe's most distinguished theologians, Professor J. P. M. v. d. Ploeg, O.P. of the University of Nijmegen, a most penetrating study of what he calls "the new ecclesiology" within the Church. Written with great clarity, the implications of this brilliant analysis are not only enlightening, but, in many ways, extremely disturbing.

A New Ecclesiology?

REV. PROF. DR. J. P. M. v. d. PLOEG, O.P.

THE French periodical *Una Voce* published in its issue for July-October, 1977 the text of an address given at an international congress on sacred music, held at Versailles, 5-8 May 1977, by Dr. Eric M. de Saventhem, President of the international *Una Voce* Federation. The text contains a passage of special interest (p. 132). Dr. de Saventhem had a long interview in Rome with Mgr. (now Cardinal) Benelli on various liturgical questions. It seems that he tried vainly to convince him of the precarious character of the changes introduced into the liturgy of the Western Church after the last Vatican Council. It was to no effect. At the end, Dr. Saventhem asked the Prelate whether the traditional liturgy could not be permitted at the side of the new one. The answer was startling: "Sir, all these reforms go in the same direction, whereas the old Mass represents another ecclesiology"! De Saventhem: "Monseigneur, what you said is an enormity"! Benelli: "What did I say"? De Saventhem repeated the phrase and Benelli answered: "I shall say it again: those who want to have the old Mass have another ecclesiology".

"Another ecclesiology" does not necessarily mean "another Faith"; it can be another elaboration of the same Faith. But it is certainly a dangerous expression, because "ecclesiology" includes the Faith. Now, it is clear that at least the bulk of the Traditionalists who prefer the old,

ditional liturgy to the new one, did not change their
th, nor do we think that Mgr. Benelli did. Since the
ditionalists did not change their ecclesiology, it follows
efore, that Mgr. Benelli did. This "change of eccesiol-
" seems to include new ideas with regard to the func-
ing of the Church in this world, its relationship with the
owers of other religions and those who have no religion
all, its relationship to "the world" and organisations in
world.

COMMUNION WITH THE CHURCH: NEW IDEAS

In former times it was considered important above all
to know who was a member of the Church and who
not. Either you belonged to the Church or you did not.
Therefore, you could be excommunicated. Excommunica-
a was practised in the Church from the days of St. Paul
1 Cor. 5, 4-5; Tim. 1, 20) until very recently. The Code
Canon Law gives rules on excommunication (cf. can.
7-2267) and its effects with regard to those who are
lared "anathema" (can. 2257, 2).

In his encyclical, *Mystici Corporis*, (29.6.1943), Pius XII
lared that only those are really members of the Church
o are baptized and profess the true Faith, provided they
not separate themselves miserably from the Church of
rist or were excluded from her by legitimate authority
ause of most serious deed (no. 21). One who does not
en to the Church is to be considered, in accordance with
commandment of the Lord (Matt. 18, 17) as a Gentile
a publican (ib. 21). Sinners are not excluded from the
urch, because not every crime is apt, of its own nature,
separate a man from the Body of the Church, as do
esy, schism and apostasy (ib. 22).

Under the Pontificate of Paul VI excommunication is still
oretically) possible, but it is never practised by central
lesiastical Authority. The worst heretics are often not
n punished, let alone excommunicated. No heretical
k is officially and solemnly condemned. Bishops who
licly criticize a doctrinal pontifical encyclical like
Humane Vitae, or virtually reject it (as the Dutch bishops
are not even rebuked openly by the reigning Pontiff.
the past, the errors of an heretical synod like that of

Pistoia (1786) were condemned; but those of the much worse, so called "Pastoral Council" of the Netherlands received no ecclesiastical censure at all. The only sign of Roman displeasure was that the papal Pro-Nuncio was forbidden to assist at its last sessions. The gatherings at Noordwijkerhout were a caricature of a true Catholic Synod and greatly influenced the de-catholisation, even the de-christianisation of the Netherlands and its Catholic Church. The "Council" set a bad example and was followed by more or less similar ones in other countries. The history of the Dutch *New Catechism* need not to be repeated here. It was *virtually* condemned by an *ad hoc* commission of Cardinals and theologians, appointed by Paul VI. Before Vatican II, the effect of this finding would have been to make the book *anathema* for Catholics, as a very bad guide for their faith (Cardinal Alfrink had called it "a sur guide"). Under Paul VI it was quite different, as we all know. There is no need to repeat the story.

Why this present, completely different attitude and what were the reasons for it never explained to the Faithful? The simple phrase, "excommunication is no longer appropriate to our time", is no answer. *Why* is it not appropriate? If one persistently fails to observe the rules of, say, a football club, he is expelled: Why not, then, from an organisation like the Catholic Church, which practised excommunication (expulsion) from its very beginning? It seems to the present writer that the answer of Cardinal Benelli to Dr. de Saventhem provides a clue—there is now a new ecclesiology. We will try to explain what this is and what it implies.

During the Second Vatican Council and after it, greater importance than ever was attached in certain quarters to doctrines and institutions which unite Christians as distinct from those which divide them. In a time such as ours, during which our whole civilisation is under the menace of cultural and political atheism, this is understandable enough and even explains why a Roman Secretariate should try to establish relations with Islam—that old, fierce and cruel enemy of Christianity—in order to defend a common belief in one God. But, even so, essential differences must never be overlooked, still less minimised; and appropriate cor-

sions should always be drawn. The Church can never hold truth without condemning heresy and error. As long as she wishes to remain what she always was, she has to exclude those who do not share the Faith that is her's. A refusal to do this endangers the whole Church.

It is to be noted carefully that the Second Vatican Council laid special emphasis on the doctrine, or the idea, of *partial communion* with the Church. In Germany, Dr. Johannes Kröger, O.S.P. has drawn attention recently to the fact that, in the conciliar *Decree on Ecumenism*, the idea of "imperfect communion" (*communio*) with the Church is a very important, even a leading one⁽¹⁾. In the course of time, the Decree says, Christian communities have come into being, which are outside "the full communion" (*plenā communio*) of the Catholic Church. The Decree proceeds to say that "all those who believe in Christ and have received baptism, are in a certain communion with the Catholic Church, though not in a perfect one" (no. 3). Outside the visible limits of the Catholic Church, "elements" (*elementa*) are found which belong to the Church of Christ; the written Word of God, the life of Grace, the theological virtues, interior gifts of the Holy Spirit and visible elements (no. 3). In the dogmatic *Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)* the same idea had been expressed already. In no. 14, this *Constitution* speaks of those who are "fully incorporated in the Church"; and in no. 15, of those Christians who do not confess the whole Faith of the Catholic Church, nor the "unity of communion under the Successor of Peter", but with whom, nevertheless, "the Church is linked (*coniuncta*) for various reasons".

Those who have not yet received the Gospel or do not believe in it are not said to be in communion, however imperfect, with the Church; but they are said to be "in various ways ordered towards the People of God" (no. 16: *ad vultum Dei variis rationibus ordinantur*"). Here the *Constitution* quotes even St. Thomas, all too absent from the texts of Vatican II (*Summa Th.* III, q. viii, art. 3 ad 1). In his article of his *Summa*, St. Thomas treats the question whether Christ is the head of the whole of humanity. The answer of the holy doctor is affirmative; because St. Paul

calls Christ "the Saviour of all men, especially of the Faithful" (1 Tim. 4, 10). He made satisfaction for our sins, "but also for those of the whole world" (1 John 2, 2). To make this more clear St. Thomas distinguishes between the various modes of belonging to the Mystical Body of Christ. He makes a distinction between *actual* belonging to the Mystical Body (in the Glory of Heaven; on earth, through the love of God, or by faith only) and a *potential* belonging to it (I refer to those who do not yet belong to the Church but shall become its members in the future; those who might become, but shall never become united with Christ).

In the *Declaration on the Relations of the Church with non-Christian Religions*, it is said that those religions not infrequently reflect "a ray of that Truth which illuminates all men"; but only in Christ do they find the "fullness of religious life" (no. 2). The word *communio* (communion) has been avoided, not the word *plenitudo* (fullness). But, in no. 1 of the same *Declaration*, it is said that all the people of the earth form one community (*communitas*). But those who form a community are in communion with each other from which one can easily conclude that there is also a certain religious *communio* in various degrees with those who profess pagan religions.

What is said by the Council in these words, however vague they may be, is true. This cannot be doubted. Nor is it a new doctrine. Long before the Second Vatican Council, we knew that Catholics had a lot of things in common with other Christians and even with all men. But partial or imperfect communion was, for the most part, not called "communion". It was simply assumed that Catholics, for example, were *not* living in communion with the Byzantine Orthodox Church, and the Orthodox will still affirm the same. When the possibility of the eventual establishment of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and Greece was studied by the Greek Government, the Greek Orthodox Hierarchy vehemently opposed the plan and at the end of 1976 even threatened civil disobedience. Then the Athenian newspaper *To Vima* sent a correspondent to Rome to contact the Vatican. He was received by the Spanish Archbishop Ramon Torrella Cascante, who declared that, since the Second Vatican Council, the Holy Ghost "has illumined

d our minds and has showed us with greater clearness
t the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Churches are
ted by a *communio* so profound that little is lacking to
ke it total". (To Vima 7/4/1978.)⁽²⁾ This means that
ugh the Orthodox Church in Greece does not wish to be
 communion with the Holy See (its Hierarchy showing
 traditional aversion from "Rome"), a voice in Rome
 lares; "Dear Orthodox Brethren, though you do not
 ow it or recognize it, you are in nearly 99% communion
 h us"! The difference of meaning attached to the word
 mmunion" could not be expressed more clearly. The
 anish Archbishop meant: you have the same sacraments
 we have, the same priesthood, a lot of identical doc-
 nes. He was silent on the differences which are not small,
 ecially in the eyes of the Greeks, who have a different
 a of the Church and its organisation, a different idea of
 Papacy, different ideas on other questions of dogmatic
 ue; who reject 14 of the 21 Oecumenical Councils recog-
 ed by the Roman Catholic Church (Vatican II included),
 o refuse every *communio in sacris* with it, etc. For Bis-
 o Torrella all these things amounted to hardly anything,
 ve are to give to his words the meaning they obviously
 ar. It is safe to say that the Vice-Secretary of the Secre-
 iate for Christian Unity strongly exaggerated.

f St. Thomas Aquinas had been asked, whether
 re was communion between Catholics and other Chris-
 ns, he would probably have answered: *Communio?*
 apliciter; No; *secundum quid*; Yes. This means: with-
 any essential restriction; No; under some particular
 ects; Yes. This is only one example where a term, used
 a document of Vatican II, is not clear but ambiguous.
 e hope expressed by Pope John in his opening address
 the beginning of his Council; that its documents would
 as clear as those of Vatican I and of Trent (though many
 not wish this, he added ominously) was not fulfilled.
 After the Council a development took place in which it
 lear that the idea of "communion" with its various as-
 ts became more and more important in the policy of the
 tral Authority of the Church. It amounted to this; no
 sting "communion" should be broken (though *the other*
 ty may break or "diminish" it; or, rather, make it "less
 ", "less perfect") and relations should be established

with everybody. The Holy See was to become a world wide centre with the maximum of communications everywhere. There are now three official Secretariates in Rome one for the relations with other Christians, another for the relations with non-Christians and a third one for those with non-believers. All kind of peoples, even Communists and declared enemies of the Church (like Kadar of Hungary) are received in public audience by the Holy Father. Only one group is excepted: the Catholic traditionalists, better called traditional Catholics. But of them we are not speaking here. They are opposed to some totally new postconciliar changes in the Church and are therefore repudiated, if not persecuted. This is one of the not very glorious pages in the history of the Church.

A consequence of this is that excommunication became obsolete. Because it is still in canon law, a Bishop might pronounce it, but the Holy See does not. The Vatican does not even solemnly condemn a theologian, though he may be a Küng, because this would be at variance with the idea of keeping communion, perfect or "imperfect", with everybody⁽³⁾. A now deceased high prelate of the Roman Curia told the author of these pages a few years ago that, in conversation with Pope Paul, he suggested to the Holy Father that, in a certain country, some strong measure should be taken to ensure ecclesiastical discipline and Faith. The answer was: *Nulla rottura!* No' breaking. Therefore, no explicit condemnation of the *Dutch Catechism* and of others equally heretical, of Schillebeeckx, Küng and company, of the Bishop's Conferences which criticise or opposed *Humanae Vitae*, of the Dutch "Pastoral Council", etc.

The *Osservatore Romano* of 1 June, 1977 published a short summary of matters treated in the last plenary assembly of the commission of Cardinals and experts who are preparing the new Code of Canon Law and it revealed that a new idea of excommunication was proposed and discussed. It was not disclosed how the traditional idea of excommunication (=exclusion from the community of the Faithful) was to be changed. The notice was highly significant for those who understand and study post-conciliar ecclesiastical practice.

According to canon 2314 of the present Code of Canon Law, those who give up the Christian Faith, heretics and schismatics, are excommunicated and are to be deprived of the offices they hold in the Church. See also canons 2316-2318. These canons are most reasonable, to say the least, in the line of the Catholic idea of the Church and its oldest traditions. Now they are hardly observed: we may cite heretical bishops (e.g. those who openly defend theetical *Dutch Catechism*) and a host of theologians and professors of theology (not to speak of others), who openly deny one or more articles of the Faith, or even its very foundations (the modernists). Though the Holy See is not inactive with regard to some of them, they are not officially and publicly condemned, still less excommunicated. Their "communion" (imperfect) with the Church or the Holy See should not be broken. Their presence in the visible Church may be unbearable to many of the Faithful. They may lose their faith because of their errors, promoted from their chairs within the Church, but they are not expelled. The idea of "communion" (though imperfect) prevails over that of orthodoxy. This is a momentous change, not only in the policy of the Church, but even in its eschatology, i.e. the theological conclusions and their practical consequences to be drawn from the Faith with regard to the Church. "Communion" is considered now as more important than anything else: it should never and nowhere be broken, but maintained and intensified.

To a lesser degree, this applies also to those who do not profess the Christian Faith or who do not have any faith at all. Communion with them should be fostered and promoted, wherever this is possible. The Vicar of Christ should become more and more, not only the Father of the Catholic Church and of all Christians, but also of the whole humanity, though at present this can only be in different degrees. All men should be drawn nearer and nearer to the Catholic truth, awaiting their *full* communion with the Church of Christ. To realise this grandiose idea, no sacrifice should be too high, not even the sacrifice of internal unity and growing disunion within the Church itself, the loss of priestly and religious vocations, the disloyalty of so many sacred ministers of the Church and of those who

consecrated their lives to the Lord, the loss of faith of hundreds of thousands.

There are some indications that Pope Paul VI may be underestimating or even ignoring everything that is really happening in the Church, as when, for example, we hear him saying in a Consistory to the assembled Cardinals that there are only a few heretics in the Church, but they cry very loudly. We know how many there are: their number is legion. The present situation of the Church is extremely serious but, as happened in former times (we think of the sixteenth century and the Protestant Reformation), the true meaning of the facts and their highly serious character, the threat they present to the whole Church, is being perceived too slowly by those Roman Prelates and Rulers who determine or influence the policy of its Central Authority. At present, the ideology of universal communion with everybody, which entails the refusal to sever any existing bond or relations, prevails, as a major element or, perhaps, the major element, of Church policy.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

Since the Second Vatican Council we are witnessing what seems to be a changed attitude of the Church with regard to its relationship with the "World". In the first chapter of Holy Scripture, we read that God created everything and that it was good, even very good. He created man in His own likeness and similitude and what could be better? But sin came, followed by suffering and death and by a growing disorder, religious and moral, in humanity. The situation became so serious that the New Testament only speaks of the "World" in a bad sense. Saint Paul: "Be not fashioned according to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God" (Romans 12, 2). Saint John: "He was in the world and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not" (John, 1, 10). Many other texts could be added and special attention should be drawn to the fact that, in the Gospel of St. John, there is a perpetual opposition between the World, which is bad, and Christ, His disciples, and His doctrine. The World is to be saved (John 3, 17) because it needs salvation: it hates the

disciples of Christ and Christ Himself (John 15, 18, 19). Therefore, true followers of Jesus cannot love the world nor the things of this world (1 John 2, 15). In these texts, the term "World" is an equivalent to fallen and sinful humanity; it is bad and those who belong to Christ must separate themselves from it.

With the birth of "Christian Humanism" other ideas were born gradually among the "Christian humanists" and many other Christians. The World is not bad but good, they said, and a Christian should even do his best to make it always more perfect. This good World is not mere fallen humanity, but the whole earth (or, even, the cosmos) with its excellent qualities and riches, and man as the centre of it, who not only cultivates it but brings it to perfection. Having created mankind, God told man to be fruitful and multiply, to replenish the earth and subdue it, to have dominion over every living thing in it (Gen. 1, 28). Therefore, the task of the Christian is to discover and to develop the World and to bring it to perfection in every respect; social, scientific, cultural, artistic, etc.

The complaint was raised against the Church that it had kept too much aloof from the World, at variance with the order of creation and the orders given by God himself. The Church had only been preparing men for another world and had taken for granted its present condition in which misery, suffering, ignorance, injustice (especially social) prevail. In accordance with these ideas, the Church considered Jesus Christ only as God and not, or very insufficiently, as man. Being man, Jesus says "yes" to everything human and consequently we have a duty to bring the World to (human, natural) perfection. Erasmus was one of the first Christians to speak this language out loud and he was followed by numerous others.

The Second Vatican Council has described the relations of the Church with the world of today in its Pastoral Constitution, *Gaudium et Spes* (GS). This Constitution had not been prepared before the Council, as had other *schemas*; but was, in a certain way anticipated by a radio-television address of Pope John XXIII on September 11, 1962, one month before the opening of the Council⁽⁴⁾. The theme of that address was, as Wiltgen says, "that Christ had illumin-

ated the Church, and that it was the Church's mission to illuminate the nations"; the Church, Pope John asserted, has responsibilities and obligations bearing on every phase of modern life. A short outline of the genesis of the document can be read in Wiltgen's book and the result is among the documents of the Council. Professor George May has written that the Pastoral Constitution "has delineated a too optimistic and therefore unrealistic image of the present world. Essential aspects, indispensable for a complete idea according to revelation and experience, have not been expressed or not been sufficiently developed"⁽⁵⁾. Council Fathers did not spare the drafts of the Constitution similar reproaches and Cardinal Heenan called the schema "unworthy of an Ecumenical Council"⁽⁶⁾. By others this Constitution was acclaimed as the most important document of the Council. Where is the truth in all this?

It is clear that, in the document, the scriptural idea of "world" (i.e. humanity lying in sin and under the dominion of the Prince of evil) is not particularly stressed, though it is not totally absent (cf. no. 37, where even Rom. 12, 2 is quoted; see also no. 79-82 on war and the prevention of it). But, as a whole, the document is pervaded by optimism and by great confidence in purely human possibilities and values, which one is at a loss to find in Holy Scripture or in the writings of the Fathers and the documents of the Magisterium. This is not meant as criticism but as a statement of a fact. The document speaks with admiration and, in many words, of the progress of human science and technology and emphasizes the duty of Christians to collaborate with others in the promotion of purely human culture. "We witness the birth of a new humanism", it says, "in which man is before all defined (*definitur*) by his responsibility towards his brothers and towards history" (Nr. 55). It is not clear what these last words mean, but the word "humanism" is there and those who drafted the document wished it to be pronounced; this humanism is described as a Christian attitude.

When one considers the dangers which many aspects of modern civilisation and "culture" constitute for Christianity and for the Church, one deplores the fact that their eventual description and a warning against them do not occupy

a much larger part of this Council document. Some seemingly internal contradictions, probably a result of repeated drafting and of compromise, could have been avoided. The distinction between natural and supernatural, for example, could have been indicated more clearly; and there are things one could wish for. As a whole, the document does not contradict previous doctrine, provided it is read and interpreted according to what theologians call the "analogy of faith". So it was certainly understood by the majority of the Fathers, though clearly not by certain *periti* and modern theologians, as events have proved.

Jesus Christ came to save us from our sins. He did not come to promote human culture. He did not even deliver His people from the colonial slavery of the Romans. To do anything like this would have been *beneath the dignity* of the Son of God who became man to give us eternal life. But Jesus is the supreme example of the Church and the Head of the Mystical Body. Though He did not promote human culture, He preached charity, and it is this *charity* which impels us "to work for the good of all, especially of the members of the household of the faith" (Gal. 6, 10). This charity impels us to work not only for their spiritual needs, but for their cultural and social ones as well, *as ordained towards the spiritual goal of man : eternal life in union with God*. In her long history the Church, or rather her institutions and her outstanding members, promoted culture and human welfare. Monks living according to the rule of St. Benedict not only announced the Faith to the barbarian nations of Western Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire, but they preserved the cultural heritage of Rome for future generations and contributed to the building of a new western society. In the Middle Ages, Christian universities flourished and were centres of learning. In the last two centuries, papal encyclicals tried to lay down principles of human social order considered from a Christian standpoint. But in so far as all these activities were purely human and did not discriminate between Christians and non-Christians they were not exercised by the Church *as such*, i.e. as a supernatural institution, created by Our Lord for the *salvation of men*. The Church has not two distinct duties : one with regard to supernatural salvation and eter-

nal life and another with regard to purely human welfare on this earth. This is why *Gaudium et Spes* calls "worldly tasks and activities" the proper field of action for laymen, though not exclusively theirs (no. 43). This means that the Church *as such*, as a supernatural institution, founded by Christ for the *salvation* of men destined for eternal life, has not to serve "the wordly world", or the purely human promotion of the welfare of mankind *without any relation to the supernatural vocation of the Christian*.

What has been said above is confirmed by the fact that the Pastoral Constitution, *Gaudium et Spes*, stresses very strongly the "autonomy of earthly things" (*terrenarum rerum autonomiam*), no. 36; the word "autonomy" also, in nos. 20; 41; 56; 59; 71, is one of the key-words of GS. True, this autonomy is not absolute but nevertheless very real. It is no new discovery because the Church has always recognized wordly autonomy; e.g. the autonomy of the State in its own sphere and on its own terrain. But the way the autonomy of earthly values is emphasized and stressed in *Gaudium et Spes* is nevertheless striking and an indication of a special way of thinking on the part of the Commission which drafted it. But we must maintain that the Church, as such, as a divine institution for the salvation of men, cannot pursue the purely human promotion of human values as her proper object.

Many theologians of the present time think differently. They are mostly or even only interested in a Church which promotes human welfare for its own sake; *re* specially better living conditions for all men, social justice and "peace". The South American theology-of-liberation theologians are only *primarily* interested in earthly "liberation": from fear, hunger, poverty, capitalism, etc. That this is completely at variance with the doctrine of the Church needs no comment. Others seem to attribute a double purpose to the Church and its activities, an opinion which some attribute to Paul VI. In his allocution at the closure of the second Vatican Council he emphasized the fact that man had absorbed the attention of the Synod. He asked modern humanists to recognize "our new humanism: we too, more than anybody, have the cult of man"! But highly rhetorical words like these are not to be taken literally.

ope Paul VI had not intention of falling down before the statue of man to adore it. However, the fact of particular emphasis remains and is liable to be misunderstood. The Church discovered man, Paul VI wished to say, not only as pilgrim in a valley of tears on his way to the Jerusalem which is above, but as a free and responsible being, created by God. This creature, as also the whole world, the cosmos, has an absolute (though finite) value, derived from the Creator and leading implicitly to Him. The Church has a "cult" of this creature of God, wishing to promote its authentic values even without explicitly considering their relationship to God. Combined with this is confidence (*fidelucia*) in man and his possibilities. In the ears of many this sounds very liberal and does not take sufficiently into account the sinfulness of human nature. In the past, the Church always emphasized the latter, not humanism. At a time like our own, in which man is made the absolute centre, measure and value of all things, words like these are apt to be misunderstood as a "conversion to the world".

CHURCH AND STATE

This new emphasis laid on the autonomy of human values and, consequently, on that of the State led to a new concept of the ideal relationship between Church and State. On December 12, 1976, the *Osservatore Romano* published the text of an allocution of Cardinal Colombo, Archbishop of Milan, under the heading: "No privileges, but authentic freedom for the Church". The State should not be "confessional" he said and should have "a healthy lay-character" (*lo Stato affermi la sua sana laicità*). The idea of an *Etat laïc*, so long an object of contradiction from the side of devout Catholics, is now to become the new Catholic ideal, not only for practical, but also for theoretical reasons. This Lay State should not have any state religion. This does not mean that it must not be without any morality, but its activity should only be inspired by those ethical principles, which cannot be transgressed without crippling the dignity of the human person. In Italy, they are embodied in the constitution of the Italian Republic and the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man. In this Lay State the Church should enjoy complete freedom; she asks for

neither more nor less. *She does not wish for any privileges but only freedom; freedom also for others who believe and for those who do not believe, because freedom is un bene indivisible and cannot be denied to anybody.* In an allocution before the King and Queen of Spain at an audience of February 10, 1977, Paul VI affirmed that the Church does not ask any privileges from the State but only "sufficient space for the freedom in which she will be able to develop her mission of evangelisation and to offer to society the service of her collaboration for the common good of the Spaniards" (*Osservatore Romano*, 11.2.1977).

This new conception of the relations between Church and State involves a new idea of the functioning of the Church. The ideal is no more that of close collaboration between Church and State in a symbiosis in which the activity of the State is pervaded with and guided by Christian principles. The new ideal (it is not only an idea) is that the Church must have complete freedom to attain her own proper goal. At the same time she offers her services to the autonomous Lay State to help to achieve its own, proper secular goal.

LITURGY AND THE AUTONOMY OF THE SECULAR

The ideas of *Gaudium et Spes* have penetrated the new (official) post-conciliar liturgy. This deserves to be treated at length, but this article is not the proper place for that. Let it suffice to quote some examples.

In the *Postcommunio* of the Second Sunday of Advent, the Church prayed during many centuries:

... *ut, huius participatione mysterii, doceas nos terrena despiciere et amare caelestia* ...

... that, through the participation of this mystery, Thou teacheth us to despise earthly things and to love heavenly ones ...

Because this was not in line with the high esteem of "earthly values" expressed in GS the last words were changed into:

... *doceas nos terrena sapienter perpendere et amare caelestia* ...

... Thou teacheth us to consider the earthly things with wisdom and to love the heavenly ones ...

In the Collects of the Feast of St. Albert the Great (15 November) it was said that God had made Albert great "in *subjecting* human wisdom to divine faith". Because of the new doctrine of the autonomy of human wisdom this had to be changed into "*combining* human wisdom with divine faith". In 1925, Pope Pius XI introduced the Feast of Christ the King, to emphasize the dominion of Christ over all things, including human society. In the encyclical, *Quas primas*, in which Pius XI promulgated the Feast and explained his reasons for doing so, he emphasized the spiritual character of the Kingdom of Christ. But he added: "One who would not allot to Christ dominion (*imperium*) with regard to civil matters, would commit an abominable mistake". But now, because such sentiments no longer accord with an ecclesiology like that of Cardinal Calombo of Milan, the ecclesiastical standing of the Feast has been drastically changed and curtailed. The date also has been changed. Formerly, it was celebrated on the last Sunday of October, close to the Feast of All Saints; now it is celebrated at the end of the ecclesiastical year, to mark the "eschatalogical" meaning of the Feast. Christ will be King of the World at the end of time.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH

A third series of considerations concerns the government of the Church. There was a strong tendency at the Second Vatican Council to replace the one-head government of the Successor of St. Peter by a collegial one; viz., that of the Pope and the College of Bishops. Endeavours to introduce this revolutionary change did not succeed, as we know. But this does not mean that none of the wishes of liberal bishops and theologians were met after the Council. Conciliarism made its entry into the Church. Its government was strongly decentralized, the Roman Congregations were deprived of the power they had hitherto enjoyed of issuing orders to be obeyed by local bishops; as a result, they have been to a large extent practically paralysed. The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, formerly the Holy Office, can no longer issue orders that Hans Küng should appear before it or else be suspended or excommunicated. All it can do is ask the arch-heretic in friendly fashion (having

first duly informed his bishop) to come to Rome for a conversation. When Fr. John McNeill, S.J. published in the United States a book on *The Church and Homosexual*, a few days after the publication of the Roman Declaration on *Certain Questions of Sexual Ethics* (16/1/1976, *Osservatore Romano*), in which he attacked the doctrine of the Church on homosexuality (with the *Imprimi Potest* of his Provincial), the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith sent a letter to Fr. Arrupe, Superior General of the Society of Jesus, strongly criticizing the book, the *Imprimi Potest* and the publicity given to it by its author⁽⁷⁾. At the end of the letter, the Congregation indicated certain measures which should be taken (By Fr. Arrupe? Even that is not said), but prescribing nothing (the *Imprimi Potest* "should be withdrawn; "it seems urgent to forbid Fr. McNeill . . ."). In the case of two Roman Congregations the present author was told: "the Congregation had been paralysed"; in another a Cardinal began by saying: "Father, what can we do . . ."?

This partial paralysis of the Roman Congregations coincides with a marked decentralisation of the central government of the Church; with a tendency to give great power to Bishops' Conferences, which become more and more of an intermediate authority, interposed between the Pope and his Secretariate of State and local bishops. The Roman Pontiff himself, though not giving up his prerogatives, seems to consider himself more and more as the one who has "to maintain the unity of the Church" and to act as a binding force between the various local Churches, now called *ecclesiae particulares*. Those liberal theologians who still wish to see the Bishop of Rome in some way at the head of the Church or, rather, of a world-union of local churches, would like to give him the role of an arbiter, with or without effective power. Paul VI will never accept this, but in practice he meets the wishes of the liberals halfway or even more. A bishop in his diocese has become nearly untouchable and has not much to fear from the Holy See, even if he publicly disagrees with it in important matters (cf. the reception of *Humane Vitae* by a number of Bishops and their Conferences) or openly rebels against it. There are, of course, still certain limits which even a Bishop

ould not transgress but it is difficult to say where they

It seems, therefore, that the decentralisation of the government of the Church which, in its present situation, presents so great a threat to her unity, has something to do with what has been called "a new ecclesiology". It is difficult to say how far the personal style of governing of Paul VI has been influenced by it. Some years ago he declared to the Italian Bishop's Conference that there were two ways of governing. One way is to use a strong hand: *pesare sugli altri* ("to press others"); another way is to speak with them and to try to convince them to do their duty. He was very well aware of the disadvantages of the second method, he decided, but he had chosen it for his government of the Church and he asked the Italian Bishops to do the same. It is quite clear that in the case of an organisation like the Catholic Church, those in authority should try before all else to induce their subjects to do their duty; but there is no limit. Authority must not refrain from commanding and, when necessary, from punishing, if the nature of the matter and, especially, the common good demand ask it.

It may be that the policy of talking, of trying to persuade and only rarely taking strong measures is for Paul VI a consequence of the new ecclesiology, but this is not clear. In Rome, it is often ascribed to what is called "his character", a word which may have several meanings. Some Popes have been born rulers, others have not. A conspicuous example of the last category is that of St. Celestine V (Pope 1294), who abdicated after not even four months of government. To the first group belong Popes like Boniface VIII, St. Pius V, Sixtus V, Pius IX, to mention only a few of them. Ludwig von Pastor, quoting Ranke, called Clement VII (1513-1534) "the most disastrous of all the Popes"⁽⁹⁾. Near the Tomb of his predecessor, Adrian VI (1522-1523), in the Church of S. Maria dell Anima in Rome, one can read the words (we translate): "Oh, how important is it in what time can work even with the most excellent man"⁽⁹⁾; the meaning of these words is that Adrian, excellent though he was, could not help but achieve little, time having been against him. The circumstances under which Paul VI has to govern the Church are certainly bad enough and the Second Vatican Council, which

occasioned an explosion of modernism that still shatters the Church, was called not by him, but by his predecessors.

NOT A NEW FAITH

It may be asked whether "the new ecclesiology", of which the preceding pages have tried to describe some features, is a legitimate development of Catholic doctrine or a temporary deviation. It is perhaps too early to pronounce a definitive and well balanced judgment. A new ecclesiology is not a new Faith, as long as it is not imposed on the whole Church as an infallible doctrine. It is not likely that this will be the case very soon; and the author of this article thinks it will never be.

NOTES

- (1) Cf. Letter 165 of the *Beda-Kreis* (Mannheim 51, Ilvesheimerstr. 81) 13. 1978, p. 30. 151. seq.
- (2) See the Catholic Bulletin, *Typos* (Athens 815, Acharnon 240, 15. 5. 1978, p. 7.
- (3) The German Bishops and the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith issued declarations saying that a number of Kung's opinions were incompatible with Catholic faith, but not even disciplinary measures were taken against him.
- (4) See M. Wiltgen, *The Rhine flows into the Tiber*, New York, 1967, p. 206; and Augustine Publishing Co., U.K.
- (5) In *Erasmus* (Fr. Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden, Germany), XX 1968, col. 76.
- (6) Cf. Wiltgen, op. cit. (above, under 4), p. 210.
- (7) Cf. *Documentation Catholique* (Paris), 1978, pp. 309-311.
- (8) Cf. L. von Pastor, *Geschichte der Papste IV/2* (Herder & Co., 1956), p. 54.
- (9) Cf. L. von Pastor, op. cit. (above, under 8), p. 149.

MINI-TRILOGY ON THE MASS

The Tridentine Mass...pp. 32; 30p or \$1 (post-free)

The New Masspp. 40; 30p or \$1 (post-free)

The Roman Rite

Destroyedpp. 48; 35p or \$1 (post-free)

All three by Michael Davies. Essential reading.
Argument unbreakable. Obtain from publishers:

Augustine Publishing Company,
Chawleigh,
Chulmleigh,
Devon EX18 7HL, U.K.

Letters to Lucifer : 6

R. S.

Dullflat Industrial Estate,
Pinfield, Buckfordshire.

From Archliar Nicholas to his Sovereign Lord Lucifer
meetings, my Lord,

In accordance with Your orders, I saw Impious off from Bruno's, and came on here. I must say, my Lord, he took it very badly, saying a lot of sharp and peevish things under his breath, one of which sounded to Me like : "Who ever heard of an *obedient* devil"? However, since You have by now reduced him to nothing, it does not matter much what he said.

As You surmised, my Lord, it is sheer waste to leave a representative at St. Bruno's. These monks keep their Rule, and that is the beginning and the end of it. They have never relaxed their strict Silence, and so have never needed reform; this has given them enormous spiritual strength which is more than a match for Us.

Your further letter has just arrived by thunderbolt at the sight of a terrific storm. I must admit I was rather frightened, as my nerves have not been the same since Pius X flew Me over the dome of St. Peters, but as You are so pleased with my conduct of affairs at St. Bruno's, no doubt this was one of my Lord's little jokes.

I will of course proceed without delay to the Carmelite convent on Paradise Island. Since You have persuaded Cardinal Luther to sign the "Declarations" ordering a 5 year period of experimentation, and they have been distributed to all the convents of the Order (thorough, are they not?), We have here the opportunity of all time. The supervising of the "shared church" can wait, as I have heard that Father Aloysius Thinktank who is to be the first Irish priest, cannot come over from U.S.A. for at least months. A letter from Paradise Island will follow.

ARCHLIAR NICHOLAS

From Archliar Nicholas to His Sovereign Lord, Lucifer

My Lord,

My glowing thanks for entrusting Me with the work he
I am indeed making history, as this is the first time any of
Us have been able to so much as land. Actually I came
over as a frog on the island boat; a humiliating expedient
but my Lord knows I stop at nothing when our interests
are at stake. Poor Impious does not seem to have taken
his Manual, otherwise he would have had no trouble about
turning himself into a serpent to get into the monks' enclosure,
as I did. I have, needless to say, brought the
Manual with Me, and last night crawled all over the Convent,
via the kitchen, the nuns being in their chapel at that
time. I have an uncomfortable feeling that the Enemy is
watching Me very closely this time, but He will as usual
let events take their course rather than interfere with the
free will of these extraordinary humans, since He seeks
their love (whatever that may be), freely given.

I have been in the Mother Prioress's office: the Document
is in her desk, and I read these "Declarations" through
very carefully. I must say that the directives in this document
seem to Me to be so ridiculous that I cannot imagine
any Prioress in her right mind carrying them out. I don't
know about Cardinal Luther, but I haven't yet seen a nun
who is suffering from softening of the brain.

Once the 5 years of Experimentation comes into operation,
it will not in the least matter what conclusions are
come to, or what shape (if any) the new Constitutions take.
The process of destruction begins the moment the Constitutions
are brought into question at the first meeting. It does
not seem to occur to any of these obtuse humans that years
of "experimentation" and "discussion" did indeed precede
the framing of their Constitutions; that they were beaten
out, with the Rule, on the anvil of human suffering, and
were the work of sanctity and genius, which is timeless
(insofar as such gifts are given to such inferior creatures).
Nor can any one of them name one single human institution
which is not governed by Rules and Regulations, or

which has been subjected to a "period of experimentation". It does not occur to any of Them, and we are not going to enlighten them, are We, my Lord?

I propose to wait for three months before making a further report, as this is a case in which We must proceed with extreme caution, if We do not want another failure like St. Bruno's.

ARCHLIAR NICHOLAS

Paradise Island,
Outer Hebrides.

My Lord,

After several months spent in watching these nuns, I think it only fair to inform your Lordship that, whatever may be done elsewhere, it is not prudent to press our ideas on the nuns in general, as they have the spirit of Obedience to a marked degree, and will do nothing without consulting their Prioress, who up to the present has made no move to bring the Declarations to their notice. I have observed her looking them through on several occasions, with her lips moving, possibly in prayer, and she has made a few notes, such as: "5 years!" "Everything then to be questioned and discussed for 5 years!" "Novices? Accept novices while the Constitutions of the Foundress are in question?" "Nothing to appeal to. . ." "What can we decide, if nothing can be settled?" "But this is from *Rome!* . . ." Only yesterday, after reading the document yet again, and obviously going through some kind of interior struggle, she locked it under her desk, and said, very quietly: "I shall appeal to the Holy Father, even if it means going to Rome". And you know, my Lord, I think she means it!

In fact, I really think We are wasting our time here when there is so much important work to be done elsewhere in the Enemy's Church. I await your Lordship's command.

ARCHLIAR NICHOLAS

This commentary on Count Tolstoy's book, published earlier this year, tells its own story. It merits thoughtful and reflective reading, which could be followed profitably by an examination of conscience.

Liberated Soviet Citizens: Britain's Final Solution

CZESLAW JESMAN

PUBLIC opinion in Britain, lately in danger of becoming jaded by the seemingly endless revelations of duplicity and horror on both sides during the Second World War has nevertheless been profoundly shocked by *Victims of Yalta* (496 pp., Hodder & Stoughton, £5.95). Nikola Tolstoy's recently-published account of the forcible repatriation of more than 2,250,000 Soviet citizens who had been liberated as the Allied forces advanced across Western Europe during the final stages of the war.

The reason for the impact of this account and the revulsion it has provoked is not hard to find. The British did not, traditionally, surrender political refugees of whatever complexion to their prospective executioners in the countries they had fled. Even during the worst period of appeasement in the 1930's, no British government would have contemplated surrendering Jewish refugees from Germany, Austria or Czechoslovakia for the sake of improved relations with the Third Reich. And this in spite of the fact that many of these refugees had fought loyally on the German side during the First World War. In similar fashion a century or so earlier, French royalist *émigrés* who had fled to England during the Terror were not repatriated even after the Treaty of Amiens. The very idea would have been seen as totally contrary to traditional notions of liberty.

What, then, made it possible for a complete about-turn in British policy in the years immediately after the Second

World War? No doubt the propaganda in favour of the Soviet Union under Stalin's leadership, which had snowballed after 1941, was a major force in preparing the ground for the events described in *Victims of Yalta*. Even in the most negative sense it made it easy for people to forget that, before Hitler's invasion of Russia in 1941, all Communist Parties, the Communist Party of Great Britain included, were active in support of Hitler because of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact of 1939-40.

In the broadest sense, it was this deliberately-induced mood of acceptance of Communist Russia which made it possible for bewildered Russian prisoners of war and labourers enslaved by the Todt organisation for work in the West (many of them from the oriental, non-Russian-speaking Soviet Republics) to be handed back to the Soviet authorities. The same mood made possible the handing over of Chetniks in Serbia, Croatian militiamen and Slovenian *domobranci* to Tito's victorious partisans.

But a mood induced by propaganda was scarcely sufficient. Governments require coherent arguments on paper to back up their decisions and these were not lacking in this case. It is impossible to determine the degree to which those responsible believed in them. Charity alone supports the view that the very magnitude and complexity of the problem coupled with the inevitable war-weariness that followed the Allied victory led those involved to seek quick and easy solutions.

Only when the whole sorry, shabby business was over did doubts about the political expediency of the operation arise. By then it was too late. I was told by the late Brigadier Firebrace, head of the War Office's Russian Liaison Group, that indiscriminate patriation had been worse than crime; it had been an act of folly for which Britain would pay dearly — and sooner than most people imagined, if they imagined anything at all. Firebrace had held this view from the first moment of the problem's being raised at Cabinet level and his thinking was based on his unparalleled knowledge both of Russia and of Stalin's devious and treacherous skills. In this connection, it is worth noting that neither Firebrace nor any of the officers serving under him were promoted or decorated after the final victory.

The relation between this lack of recognition and the efforts to save what could be salvaged from the wreck of broken promises and deceitful allegiances is obvious. Not least among these efforts was the attempt to keep the liberated Soviet citizens in camps, a benevolent Gula Archipelago, a limbo in which they could be kept out of the eye of the public and officialdom.

During the period September 1944 - March 1945, a new work of strange military installations spread over the British Isles. Their inmates were kept behind barbed wire and guarded by armed troops. And yet these same inmates were, in official terminology, "liberated citizens of the Soviet Union"—one of the two principal allies of Great Britain and a full partner in the recent victory over the Nazis. It is true that the guards restricting their movement were scarcely formidable: "blue-capped" military police, armed companies of the Pioneer Corps and a few Territorial units. The inmates, moreover, showed not the slightest desire to escape. On the contrary, their dearest wish was to stay precisely where they were—indefinitely. Furthermore, they had committed no crime and could hardly be indicted collectively under the provisions of the Allied Forces Act. They numbered approximately 70,000 and were a very mixed bag: members of various paramilitary and auxiliary "Eastern" units of the Wehrmacht, Cossacks, Balts, Georgians, Armenians, Ukrainians, White Russians, Todt labourers and a rich assortment of stragglers. All of them had been quick to surrender to the Allied invaders after the Normandy landings. Some clutched leaflets which promised them freedom and a new life in the West. These leaflets, carefully printed in indifferent Russian and even more approximate Armenian, were part of the Allies' propaganda offensive. No English version existed—perhaps because they were signed simply "Victorious Allied Armies".

Faced with this disparate mass of nationalities and tongues, the Allies made an attempt to sort them on the basis of nationality. It did not succeed. What did succeed without a major incident was the segregation of officers and men. The British especially could make nothing of this crowd of foreigners whose languages they could not

understand and who seemed quite incapable of grasping simple English. Small wonder: practically none of the prisoners could even read the Roman alphabet. A few spoke some broken German, but this was small assistance in enabling them to understand why they were not beaten, indoctrinated, bullied or why they were fed with luxuries such as corned beef and white bread, housed in barracks that were warm and dry, issued with greatcoats and clean underwear. Moreover, doctors were available and if a man were really sick he was sent to be nursed in a civilian hospital.

After about a fortnight of this incomprehensible treatment they came to the conclusion that they were being prepared for some particularly hideous programme of experiments requiring human guinea pigs—a procedure those who had experienced the more developed German camps were well acquainted with.

Gradually it dawned on them that the British did not carry out medical experiments on prisoners and that they were not being readied for exile in some unspeakable prison camp of the kind they knew all too well awaited them were they to be sent back to Russia. Many of them were well aware, too, of what had happened to the 40,000 Russian POWs repatriated by the Finns in 1940 after the Russo-Finnish war: red bunting and brass bands to welcome them at Leningrad station and then smartly entrained in units to camps in the Arctic Circle. And they knew, as they knew little else, that according to Soviet army regulations a prisoner taken alive was automatically a traitor who *might* be able to redeem himself after seven to ten years in *gulag*.

There was thus not a shadow of doubt about the extent to which the inmates of the camps in Britain were alienated from the Soviet Union. Some may have preserved a vestigial allegiance, but if they had, took good care to keep it to themselves. The vast majority experienced only one emotion at the mention of the Soviet Union and its regime: hatred. Most of them, irrespective of nationality, were peasants. Scarcely more than a decade before their capture millions of their kinsmen and neighbours had died during the forcible collectivisation of 1928-33. Millions more had been swallowed by the labour camps of Siberia and the

Arctic Circle. Millions more had been slaughtered or deported during the purges of 1936-38. Inside or outside Russia there was no love lost between the peasants on the one side and the Party and the NKVD on the other, as I learned at first hand from NKVD officers shortly after 1945. In the euphoria produced by the endless round of "victory banquets" held in Germany and Austria they admitted openly that the *svarlivyie muzhicki*—the peasant trouble-makers—had not only greeted the German invaders as liberators, but had sniped at the retreating Soviet troops. Only the unbelievable blindness and stupidity of Nazi policy in occupied Russia and the Ukraine destroyed the peasants' readiness to welcome the Germans—who were, moreover, associated with technical progress and the efficiency German immigrants had brought with them during the past hundred years.

This disillusionment with the Germans, encouraged by Soviet propaganda, led them to conclude that there was absolutely nothing to choose between Nazi tyranny and that exercised by their Communist masters. Only in the British camps did they come to perceive that there was, after all, a third way. They discovered that their British guards differed fundamentally from Himmler's Allgemeine SS. And yet this lesson was to have consequences as fatal as the others they had been compelled to learn. And it was this same lesson in the basic differences between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies that was the reason for Stalin's demands that all Soviet citizens should be sent home—demands noted by harassed liaison officers and duly dispatched to London.

As the Allies continued their advance the camps remained undisturbed. A certain amount of Soviet ceremonial was observed: British officers were invited to the "presidiums" of the assemblies celebrating the October Revolution; there were choir practices, camp improvement schemes. The very absence of any threat prevented life from becoming tedious. The officers of the Soviet Military Mission had, after a few dramatic encounters with the camp inmates during the summer of 1944, ceased to visit. As for the future, the camp administration knew as much and as little

as their charges. Things ticked over without a hitch. There were rumours, apparently from London, that the Russians might be sent back eventually. They went unheeded until suddenly, immediately before Christmas, Soviet officers appeared in strength. They were to carry out an "inspection". Despite the fact that they were not permitted to live near the camps or to participate in day-to-day administration, morale slumped overnight. Faces that had greeted British staff with smiles turned sullen. Complaints about the food (which had not been changed in any way) and draughty hutments now became innumerable. It also became obvious that the Soviet mission had its spies among the inmates. The few officers belonging to the army of General Vlasov (who had defected to the Germans) and those of KONR, all of whom had managed to conceal their rank until now, reported sick and stayed on the sick list for the duration of the Soviet officers' visit. After their departure, it was more than a week before the camp recovered its former easygoing atmosphere and even then prisoners who had been favoured with attention from the Soviet officers were shunned by the others.

In the December of 1944, the Luftwaffe suddenly launched an attack on the Midlands across the North Sea. The Army and the RAF were unprepared for this and possible further attacks. Emergency defences were set up along the Yorkshire coast and further inland. These required a considerable amount of manual labour for which there was no local manpower available. Northern Command asked a camp of liberated Soviet citizens near Beverley — some thousand well-fed, able-bodied men living in enforced idleness—if it could help. The message was passed on by the Camp Commandant through an interpreter to the inmates: would they like to help their allies "in distress"? Loud cheers. Work parties were organised immediately and after clearance from command HQ in York they drove singing to the site of the future AA gun emplacements. Anti-Aircraft Command had estimated that the job would take about a fortnight. After five days it was nearly complete. Another three and the job would have been done. At this point the Soviet mission announced that it would be

arriving for another "inspection". The British liaison officer asked Northern Command to stall the Russians until completion of the gun emplacements and requested his director in Whitehall to confirm the request. A brigadier in charge of the operation objected that there could be no harm at all in permitting the Russian officers to see what a jolly good job their fellow-countrymen were doing in the furtherance of the common cause. The Soviet officers visited the site and "inspected" the camp while most of the inmates were away working. In practice this meant that they went through the belongings of the detainees under the pretext of a detailed examination of the sanitary arrangements.

In the meantime, the news had reached the liberated Soviet citizens at work. They downed tools immediately. Interpreters and Russian Liaison Group officers were hastily summoned. British officers on the site were at a loss to explain the situation but it transpired that all of a sudden the tools had become difficult to handle; the mid-morning tea was not hot and in any case nobody felt like work that day. They saw the Soviet officers and repeated their complaints. The gun sites were abandoned. Fortunately, the Luftwaffe did not attack again.

After that last visit by the Soviet Military Mission the camp never recovered its equilibrium. Speculation about being shipped to work in Canada or Australia ceased abruptly. The digging at the sites for the gun-emplacements was not after all a qualifying test for emigration permits. The camp subsided into sullen despondency. Three months later, in March 1945, its inmates were embarked on the *SS Almanzora* at Liverpool, port of disembarkment Odessa.

It would be glib, over thirty years later, to say that the issues were clear-cut, either in the comparative calm of the camps in Britain or in the more hectic and tense conditions in Europe. Equally difficult at that time were the decisions that had to be made about who was eligible for emigration, resettlement or trial according to the rules of war. What can be said, however, is that given a less impatient justice and the absence of the singular evasiveness and callousness of the British Government, 85 per cent of the detainees

would have been eligible for and opted for emigration. Stalin's almost hypnotic power to influence Eden, added to the respect in which the latter was held at the time, made it possible for the Soviet ruler to fulfil his obsessional desire to ensure that no Soviet escapee should be allowed to escape repatriation and punishment.

Victims of Yalta, which recounts with scrupulously-documented detail the methods used to repatriate "Soviet citizens"—methods which required British Soldiers to use armed force against unarmed and trusting men, women, and, yes, children—makes uneasy reading for British citizens today. These are not merely tales of battles long ago but uncomfortable reminders of what could be in store not for subliterate Turcomans or Ukrainian peasants, but for the products of thirty years of comfort and concessions to the Soviet Union whose aims remain unchanged. We have been warned by a spectre from our own past.

THE MUDDLE OF THE MASS

by Father Bryan Houghton

available at following rates, post free:

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Single copies | 10p or US 30 cents |
| 6 copies | 40p or US \$1.50 |
| 12 copies | 70p or US \$2.50 |
| 50 copies | £3.00 or US \$8.00 |
| 100 copies | £5.00 or US \$15.00 |
| 500 copies | £25.00 or US \$70.00 |

All orders to *Christian Order*, 65, Belgrave Road, London SW1V 2BG, U.K.

This is the first of a series of four articles sparked off, you might say, by a reading of Malachi Martin's best-selling book, "The Final Conclave".

Malachi Martin's book is available from the Pro Fide Book Service, 29, Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey.

CURRENT COMMENT

The Forgotten Factor I : The Heart of the Matter

THE EDITOR

IT is strange how reviewers appear to miss so often the real point of a book, especially those which are concerned with the present confusion within the Catholic Church. The latest example is provided by a recent publication that is making the rounds fast in the United States and deservedly so. I hope it will be published soon in this country.

Kid-Stuff

Reference is to Malachi Martin's, *The Final Conclave*. Published early this year by Stein and Day, New York, it is available from the Pro Fide Book Service, 39, Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey. Over here in this country, Jeremy Campbell, the *Evening Standard's* Washington Correspondent, picked up Martin's book and presented as its main point (29/3/78) the picture of the Vatican salting away its millions in Capitalist America, whilst working, at the same time, for an accommodation with Communist Power, which it believed would soon flow over on Europe, not necessarily by way of Soviet occupa-

tion; but—far more probably—through the pressurizing of its still-free western half into an outsize Finland—independent in theory, but, in practice, no more than a satellite. Somewhat more crudely in the United States, Liz Smith, writing in the New York *Daily News* had this to say:

“Red Cardinals? Don’t say I didn’t tell you about it when former Vatican scholar and close associate of Pope John XXIII, Malachi Martin, drops the bombshell of his new book via Stein and Day any minute. Titled, *The Final Conclave*, this one is for interested Catholics and secular thinkers alike. It predicts that there is a powerful faction in the Church which will favour election of a new Pope who will make a deal with the Communist leaders of Eastern Europe.

Martin’s revelations should rock the religious-political world from Rome to Moscow. He claims many Cardinals and Vatican officials are pro-Marxist and notes that some Cardinals consider the survival of the Church to be in doubt. He says for the very first time the Soviet Union is trying to influence the Conclave that elects the Pope and depicts the role being played by U.S. Cardinals. Martin will reveal the actual process of electing a new Pope, naming a new location and new procedures for the Conclave. (Pope Paul has insisted that the next conclave have heavy electronic security).”

The Real Point of Martin’s Book

If I may say so with respect, this kind of thing is kid-stuff. It misses the real point of Martin’s penetrating book, which is not whether the Vatican should make an accommodation with this power-system or that (it has been doing so for years), Communist or anything else; but whether it should make an accommodation with any power-system at all; whether in short, the Catholic Church should rest its spiritual strength on transitory and alien temporal power or whether she should rest it on God alone—with complete trust in Him and quite irrespective of the consequences. This and this alone is the real point at issue. For years now the Church has done the opposite, shrunk from that total giving, which must be her’s if she would follow wholly in the footsteps of her Master, and sought, instead, the protection of men; which means that her message has been,

however subconsciously, on the terms of her protectors; which means that it has been half-given; which means that she has lost a world. Like the rich young man in the Gospel Story, she has turned from the perfection to which Christ has called her because, like that rich young man, she has great possessions. Like him, she has gone from Christ sad because, in the event, the preservation of those possessions rated higher with her than the true heart of the Gospel Message, which would have been her's had she dispossessed herself of those possessions, never seeking the protection of any transitory and temporal Establishment, but relying on God alone. Instead, she has paid court to one Establishment after another, adopting its manners and mores; thereby alienating herself from the poor who suffered under it and the young who alienated themselves from it and whose idealism found little response from a Church that was, so far as they could see, no more and no less than the pillar of a stagnant and oppressive *status quo*. The excuse always given was that the Church must be free from confrontation with secularist and temporal Power in order to pursue her spiritual mission. The answer, rarely given, was that she was already denying it to the extent that her social conformism emasculated the Gospel Message at her hands, thereby denying her access to those who stood most in need of her spiritual mission—the young with their ideals who met with so little response from the Church precisely because she was inhibited by the need to retain the favour of her temporal protector, and the poor whose lives she never shared for precisely the same reason.

Christ on Condition

To both of these the Church has given in the past and continues to give now, not Christ as He is and without reserve, but Christ on condition that they accept a Church, whose concern with the preservation of her institutional position over and against seemingly protective temporal Power, must cause her necessarily to blunt Christ's message. Thus, it is not the whole Christ that men receive at the hands of the Church; but a Christ encrusted with the secular, middle-class values of an increasingly secularized Establishment, which the Church is careful not to challenge because fearful of the consequences as they would affect

temporal position. Hence the gap for so long between truth of the Gospel as entrusted to her and its exhibition in practice at her hands; between Christianity in theory and in practice; between the uncompromising Christ and what appears as the over-eagerness of the Church He founded to compromise with the world. (Whether that world be the world of the Right or the Left does not matter in this context. This is what both Progressives and Traditionalists, as we shall discover later on, so often fail to see.) The whole Christ is not given, in consequence, by the Church to those who seek Him. What they get, as I have just remarked, is a caricature; Christ on condition, a half-Christ, which is not what they seek. Hence it is that those who at heart—and often, as it appears, despite themselves—are seeking the whole Christ, turn from the Church reluctantly and with a mixture of disgust and despair. What they want—let me repeat it—is not Christ on condition; but the whole Christ as He was and is. This they are not getting. So long as they do not get it, they will turn from the Church that has become for them now, where the pursuit of Christ is concerned, far more of a hindrance than a help. They will seek Him now without her. If I understand Martin right, the core of the present crisis within the Church is to be found where men to Right and Left are all not looking for it—not in the scale of contemporary doctrinal aberration, which is bad enough in all conscience; but in the rapidly increasing numbers, especially amongst the young, for whom the Church, with or without doctrinal dispute, is increasingly irrelevant because of its failure in their eyes—and, I think, truly—to give them what they most desire; which is Christ without compromise or condition, Christ as He was and is and as they, rightly, want Him; Christ whose following must be preached without compromise and practised without compromise and at no matter what cost to herself by the Church Christ founded and to whom He entrusted the truth of His Gospel.

Remember

I remember a young man, a small self-employed builder, who came to see me out of the blue one Saturday afternoon at 4 o'clock. He walked in, just like that, and asked for me. I had read an article in *Christian Order* and come. His

story was not unusual. He had been away from Church and then come back. During the interval, he had tried everything; been on booze and drugs in a big way, almost to the limit with the latter. The end of that road was despair, as it was bound to be. He had broken from it and come back. "Did you bring any of your pals in with you?" I asked him. "I couldn't and can't", he said. "There's nothing, as they see it, to bring them to". He added, "Only the Church would ask us for something; tell us to put on sackcloth and take us up the Holy Mountain, then we come—in hundreds and more". The point, surely, needs no elucidation. It follows from what I have said. So do the story of another friend—by way of being something of an intellectual—whose daughter ceased going to Mass, then disappeared. He found her eventually at the feet of a guru in a far-off land, sitting cross-legged on the floor with others like her, listening for hours at a time to what I can only describe as meditative discourses on the sacrifice required to lead a hard and virtuous life in close touch with the Absolute. Then there was the Czech priest whom Father Werenfried van Straaten quoted in *Aid to the Church's Need*. He had been presented with the opportunity of travelling through Western Europe for two months. He took it. When about to return, he said: "I was twelve years in prison because I wanted to remain true to the Church. I was tortured because I would not deny the Pope. For the sake of my Faith I lost my health. But that Faith gave me the peace and assurance that made my years in prison the happiest of my life. You have lost your peace in God. You have so undermined faith that it no longer affords any assurance. You in your freedom throw away that for which we suffer oppression. I am disappointed in the West. I would rather live another twelve years in a Communist gulag than remain here any longer with you". Would he have said the same had the Church been preaching the whole Christ and not the mere half of Him to the western world?

Tragedy of the Church Today

The tragedy of the Church today, as yesterday, lies in her failure to recognise this overpowering need of men for the real Christ and her obligation, in consequence, to give men Christ without fear or favour, quite irrespective of the

sequences. And it is this failure that has brought her to her present pass; a situation of near-collapse because confronted with a world that is passing her by, leaving her stranded in her helplessness in face of those—with many of her own children amongst them—for whom she is, as the days go by, no more than a passing irrelevance.

Awareness of this as the central problem confronting the Church runs right through the pages of Martin's book. His book is of the greatest value precisely because in it he highlights as central the failure of the Church to place the whole Christ before men. To put it brutally, the Church's concern with its position *amongst* men rather than with bringing Christ *to* them has not merely vitiated the whole post-conciliar effort, but had an effect precisely the opposite of that intended. Instead of bringing Christ *to* men, it has turned them *from* Him; left them with nothing except the spectacle of what appears as a battered and decreasably credible institution trying to maintain a precarious stance in a world with which it is taken up far too much and at the expense of its true mission, which is not to cling for position, but to bring the whole Christ to men; to make the true doctrine that Christ gave it *real and living* practice. This it is signally failing to do. The spectacle presented by the Church in its post-conciliar days continues to prove of speculative interest to some; but its capacity to move the human heart is zero.

Stark Remedy is Called For

In Martin's view the situation is so bad, so far gone, that a stark remedy is called for. It is stark and simple. In the words of the Cardinal called on to give the pre-Conclave exhortation to those assembled to elect a successor to Pope Paul in Conclave 82, which Martin styles "The Final Conclave", it is for the Papacy to be concerned no longer with position within the world, which Christ said He would not pray for, to have no more truck with temporal Power at the price of the single-mindedness of its spiritual message; but to abandon its temporalities, as the rich young man in the Gospel was called on to abandon his, and to experience once again the freedom of the sons of God, which would allow it—and which alone would allow it—to preach Christ without reserve and irrespective of the

consequences to a world which, almost in spite of itself, most truly longs for Him. Stripped of all temporal alignment in aid of worldly position, naked the Church had to follow a naked and crucified Christ; only that way, raised up on the Cross, would she draw, once again, all men to herself. Her history has been so often that of her refusal to be so raised. The words of the Cardinal *conferencier* to his brothers and colleagues in his pre-Conclave exhortation are powerfully put by Martin. They are most moving. I will quote them at length :

"My own small contribution as the one chosen to give this pre-Conclave Exhortation is intended to help Your Eminences in our difficult task. It is the fruit of much study and reflection on our long, laborious history. And if there is one lesson that leaps out at me over and over again from the pages of that history, it is that, time and time again, this institutional Church, which was founded by Jesus, which survived the catacombs, which was placed on a pinnacle by the Emperor Constantine, and which has survived all those centuries, that this Church has been brought by uncontrollable human events to the very dangerous brink, to a sheer, steep cliff of decision on more than one occasion. Unfailingly, each time, the Churchmen at the head of affairs shied away from that one stark decision. But still, time and time again, the Church is brought back to face that decision. Until now, in Conclave 82, we may face it for the final time. And believe me, all that I say of those good men who have come before us, and who have all gone to God, I say without any intention of reproach or condemnation.

"But, let me give you some ordinary examples. Pope Leo 3 in the eighth century was, for a variety of reasons, brought to the point that he no longer could exercise any temporal power at all; any financial power, any military power, any diplomatic power, any political power. Did he then renounce all claims to his temporal power and rely solely on the power and authority of Jesus ? That power Jesus promised when he said to Simon : 'You are Peter. To you I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven', as the Gospel relates ? Did he ?

"No. His Holiness, Leo 3 of happy memory, did not. He fled as a fugitive on horseback to Paderborn, kne

and kissed the hand of the Emperor Charlemagne who then proceeded to reinstall Pope Leo in even fuller exercise of all that worldly power.

"The hard decision—to rely solely on the power and spirit of Jesus—that hard decision had been refused.

"A little over six hundred years later, at the Council of Constance, the representatives and rulers of six major European nations gathered to reform the Church which had been wracked and ruined by the disputes of Popes and anti-Popes. But the main proposal in front of everybody's mind was simple: Let us once and for all rid the Papacy and the Church of Jesus of its temporal power, since it was precisely through that power that the church has been wracked by a series of devastating wars, diseases, famines, massacres, cruelties, desecrations, anti-Popes, anti-Synods, anti-Cardinals, hate, bloodshed, torture, infidelities, and the believers of the Church have been scandalized and confused.

"What happened?

"No sooner was Pope Martin 5 of happy memory elected Pope than he and his Curia of Cardinals dissolved the Council—in virtue of his supreme power as Pope. And in spite of the general wish for reform, Pope Martin of happy memory returned to Rome where he again reassembled all the elements of Papal temporal power

"But the hard, hard decision was refused once more. The Pope could only envisage his spiritual authority *within the framework of land, money, diplomatic prestige and political clout*".

lachi Martin goes on to quote further cases—Pope ment, in the middle of Luther's revolt, forced to take uge in the castle of San Angelo, whilst Rome was sacked the troops of the Emperor, Charles V; then paying a som and then, from his post outside Rome, assembling ney, prestige, armaments—all the trappings of temporal ver—in sufficient quantity to enable his restoration to throne. As a result, the Church he handed over to his cessor was one whose spiritual authority relied on the port of temporal power, so that its Gospel Message was e again inhibited by reason of that support. "The hard, d decision was again refused. No Pope could bring

himself willingly to rely for his authority solely on the promise of our Lord Jesus". Further examples are quoted right through to our own times. And then :

"The voices of all past Popes and Saints say to us no, surely : 'Listen not to the voice of the banker, not to the voice of the broker, not to the voice of the prince bishop or the ambitious Cardinal, not to the dynastic family, not to the money-changers, not to the monopoly-managers, but to the voice of Jesus speaking from the masses of our human family

"Make no mistake, Most Eminent Brethren ! That very hard decision so often offered, so often refused, comes up once more today. It stands stock still on the doorstep of Conclave 82, demanding to be allowed in, to be answered.

"If we do not allow it entry . . . we will have failed. For, more than any of the superpowers, more than any other institution on earth, we have to answer those devastating queries human beings are now asking us : 'Are you people *really* the messengers of the Holy Spirit ? Have you people your own weapons of spirit ? Your own *moral* power ? Or are you merely more than ordinary clever power-brokers, preying on our hopes, capitalizing on our broken dreams ? We know whom you say Jesus was. But tell us : Who are *you* ? What are you ?'. Thus, the hard queries of our contemporaries".

An African Cardinal Speaks

The theme is taken up again, in the concluding pages of Martin's powerful book, by Azande, the young African Cardinal, called on to address the Cardinals in Conclave and whose minds have been thrown into disarray by the knowledge that outside Communist Power has been brought to bear on a faction of its Electors. The African seizes the moment and speaks from his heart. It could be, indeed, that here we have a portent. He has had some years of curial experience at the top, but his heart is clean, his outlook open and single-minded and totally dedicated. Thus he speaks :

". . . . we must be rid of our present status. As financial giant. As diplomatic power. As beneficiaries

and even as wielders of political interests. As real estate owners and operators. All that, we must get rid of Ask around you. Walk disguised in the market place, in the parliaments of men, in their shops, their money exchanges, their clubs, their homes, their factories. Ask and you will blush. We are, according to them, the schizoid preachers. We celebrate divinity's love in the morning. We sit at Mammon's counting tables in the high noontide. We wander after hours along the boulevards of fine living in the domain of the 'beautiful people' We handle water and bread and wine, claiming that God's blessing impregnates one and that God's humanity and divinity transubstantiates the other two. But with the same consecrated hands we pocket the shekels of the Shylocks, and we deliver pocketfuls of votes to the chosen political party, and we steer contracts to the preferred clubhouse No amount of purple, my Brothers, no field of cloth-of-gold, no glistening ermine or perfumed ceremonies, no amount of human dignity can camouflage or make prettier to behold the fact that the *greatest* riches of our Church (i.e. the spiritual ones—Ed.) are caught in the poor trammels of worldliness. . . .

“ See Jesus conferring the power of the Keys on Simon Peter near Hermon have we really grasped what those keys represent? What power is given to us? Somewhere along the line of our horizontal history on this globe, we lost hold of that vertical plumbline. We confused that power with the effects of money, of political sway, of military advantage, of cultural enrichment, of humanistic glory. . . .

“This power is a force emanating from God, inhabiting those who are in God's grace. Power in spirit. And in the Keeper of the Keys and in his ministers and in the priests and in the people. This is a power that *resides* in them, that gives them moral authority — according to their grade in God's Kingdom of the Spirit. . . .

“How often in recent history has the Pope and the Vatican relied solely on that power? How often, relying on it alone, have they wielded it? Let us face the truth. For many of us Bishops, for thousands of

priests, for millions of layfolk, this power-in-spirit, this moral authority has been obscured, disguised, transmuted, degraded. We have become indentured as slaves to the fearful rigidities of a politico-economic system. And neither do we realise it, nor do we know how to get out of it. My God! Eminent Brothers, My God! And we rush to our brokers and our bankers and our realtors and our diplomats to solve our problems, instead of relying on the power of Christ. . . .

"If we really want to", Azande takes up the last exclamation, raising his own voice to be heard above the cries of the assembly, "If we have recourse to the Spirit of Jesus. Even if the whole world were covered with concrete and all our lives were mechanized in steel and chrome, even so! Some day, somehow, our faith and our reliance on that Spirit would crack that cement. And through that solitary crack the flower of faith and true worship of the Risen Christ would blossom and grow. The gleaming inanimate machinery would be festooned in the glory of God's love. And over the bleak landscape of our human life would break the sunrise of the Resurrection".

A Prophetic Book: Read and Reflect

At the end of this most moving speech by the African Cardinal, the papal electors proceed to vote and we come to the end of this splendidly written, immensely perceptive and, quite possibly, prophetic book. Readers are urged to buy it and, not merely to read, but study it with total objectivity; more, to use it by way of background against which Progressives and Traditionalists alike would do well. I think, to study their consciences, myself along with the rest. And let it be remembered, by way of footnote, that Martin is not here advocating the planned disintegration of the Institutional Church, but its disentanglement from the worldly trappings and anxieties—with the inevitable inhibiting of the Gospel Message—which alignment with temporal power inevitably brings in its train. Those who jump to premature conclusions as they read its pages will make a mistake, fall victims, maybe, to cultivated prejudice which, at this time in the Church, is so liable to be deep in us all. Those who reflect carefully on the whole of what Martin has written will be on the receiving end of great gain.

Henry Edwards writes here of Denis de Rougemont's essay on *Marxism and Christianity* of Communism's preparations for an earthly paradise of the futility of relying on material means in the struggle against it.

The Christian Eschaton

HENRY EDWARDS

IT would be very hard indeed to find a greater tribute to a Protestant theologian than the one made by Pope Pius XII who described Karl Barth as "the greatest theologian since St. Thomas Aquinas". Those progressives who would in a new spirit of ultramontanism bow down in grave silence before what Popes say, probably more or less off the cuff, and I who always had an immense admiration for Pius XII, may at this point be excused for thinking that he indulged in hyperbole on this score. Nevertheless, Karl Barth must be reckoned upon being the greatest or among the greatest of Protestant theologians of this century. At the risk of over-simplification his *Dogmatics* were to a great extent a refutation of a romantic immanentism which coloured much of Protestant thought from the advent in 1790 of Schleiermacher's book, *On Religion, Speeches to its Cultured Despisers*. Again at the risk of over-simplification, Barth called on Christian men to see that theology was no offspring, so to speak, of some philosophy of man, but nothing if not God-centred. Though in his short work published not long before his death, *The Humanity of God*, he rightly qualified, he yet asserted that, largely due to himself, though he does not explicitly say so, a change began, a change in which men were asked to look upon a lofty God, "even wholly other". "Such was the God with whom man has to do when he takes the name of God on his lips, when God encounters him, when he enters into relation with God".

Salutary Shift of Emphasis

This shift of emphasis was salutary within Protestantism

(as far, indeed, as there is any Protestantism). Barth braced his fellow Protestants to see and to grasp "the majesty of the Crucified". To some extent and, indeed, the effect was admitted, Barth was attacking Protestant liberalism. In fairness to him we should not consider him to be of that grim Calvinist type, which so clearly sees God as sovereign Lord—"God is always at the helm". My short meeting with him in 1952 made me aware that he was a most gentle Christian touched with a sense of humour unusual among Germans and certainly among most of my calvinistic friends. That is why his last little book needs to be read as a sort of jam to help swallow his rather harsh pill for those whose religion has become religiosity. Strictly speaking, he was not—he roundly denied being a Calvinist; but he confessed he would speak of "Master Calvin" as he would speak of "Master Aquinas" or "Master Augustine".

So long an introduction seems to me to be necessary in order to make a confession. For about two years I have been studying *The Future* as I read of it here and there among books and essays of both Catholics and Protestants. In my own country *Y Dyfodol* seems to have acquired something like a sacred status. One sees it even in the politics of the Nationalist Party, Plaid Cymru, which I have often had to criticise even if I am myself regarded as a Nationalist. One meets the notion in such a slogan as "Building the New Wales" or "The Wales of our Children". I keep on thinking of that little quip of G. K. Chesterton in his *Napoleon of Notting Hill* about people worshipping at the graves of their descendants—Confucianism inverted. Then one evening I came back to Wales and began thinking upon this matter of *The Future* in relation to that curious piece in Eucharistic Prayer III where *firmare digneris* is translated in the hearing of others beside me as *guide* instead of *strengthen* and where we find ourselves in "Thy Pilgrim Church". I had already tackled that in an article I had written for *Y Llan*, the Church (of England) in Wales' weekly periodical (November 11). While I was thinking, an unease stole over me. Did not Karl Barth of all men go wrong here? Almost as soon as I arrived home, from a Latin Mass Society meeting in London, I grabbed his *Humanity of God* and soon found what I wanted:

"Man bestowed with eternal life is future man". (Page 2). No! No! No! But somewhere, I believed, I had an essay in the house by a French Calvinist where precisely the opposite doctrine is taught. I was fortunate in finding the passage with more than ordinary celerity. The writer is Denis de Rougemont in an essay upon *Marxism and Christianity*. The passage deserves quotation in full.

Denis de Rougemont on Marxism and Christianity

"It seems to me that the final opposition between the Marxist creed and the personal faith of a Christian is sufficient to explain everything else. Communism is preparing for an earthly paradise, the temporal paradise of man: Christianity is preparing for an eternal Kingdom of God not of the Earth. Both are eschatological in the sense that they defer their accomplishment to a last and invariable state, to a future and complete term, attainable only after a long tribulation, a long temporal passion. And it is 'faith', the substance of things hoped for, which alone enables the believer to support the evils suffered for the sake of the ultimate end. The Christian sings at the stake, the komsokol is willing to accept a starvation wage if it be necessary for the salvation of the U.S.S.R. But the Christian *eschaton* is beyond this time, is *eternal*, and by that fact *can be immediately present in our hearts*, whereas the Marxist *eschaton*, being temporal, disappears into an infinite future—a hundred years, a thousand or two thousand years?—and cannot exist *hic et nunc*".

A man who becomes converted to Christ is a man who receives and apprehends Revelation in Person. And the Kingdom is at once within him (Luke 17, 20-21). Such a man is no longer master of his life. He is the agent of a vocation come from elsewhere, but for him alone and here below, a vocation which henceforth inspires his every action and his inmost thought. His personality is thenceforth recreated. It enters thenceforth into conflict with the world and the evil forms thereof. It testifies thenceforth in favour of the *fait accompli* of a human revolution. The Christian convert begins, then, by the end which the aspirations of Communism only looked forward to. *He already possesses the essential which Mark perceived at the farthest extremity of history: "personality"*.

(Upon this precious subject of human personality and recovery from alienation I do believe no better critic of Marxism existed than Nicholas Berdyaev, who practically lived his writing life to assert the fact of human personality in any society and was exiled by the Marxists for teaching that precious doctrine).

Christianity in Law

Of course, de Rougemont is giving us here the precisely logical recreation of a Christian convert. He concedes in a too small footnote that Christians fall short of their vocation. And when my patron saint Augustine of Hippo contended against the Pelagians, who insisted that it was easy to live a perfect life and avoid sin, he declared that, were the saints all to come back to us, they would declare with St. John the Beloved: "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves". "Non est iustus, ne unus quidem" (Romans 3, 10) "Omnes enim peccaverunt, ac deficiuntur gloria Dei" (Romans 3, 23). And though the Mother of God is the exception who proves the rule, no creature owed more to sovereign grace than the ever-virgin Mary. In respect of our conflict with Marxists and with Utopians of all sorts we must confess that we keep back this and that, laches, to use a legal term, compliance in face of grave abuses of private productive property, equal compliance in our being leagued with others in envy and greed (no less in some trade-union demand than in anything else). If in some Marxist-ridden land certain men grovel in self accusation—probably after some vile treatment of their minds—and accuse themselves of "deviation" whether to the exaggeration of the dialectic or to that of the materialism of their creed or, as like as not, to less high-flown transgressions of the code, then for us Catholics (and the Orthodox in good faith) there is that sacrament of peace to which we go without constraint—anyway, it made a saint of St. Margaret of Cortona.

A man who becomes converted to Communism does not attach himself to an actual Presence. Why, perhaps we have not quite grasped all that the Real Presence still found in our churches, though not so conspicuously pointed to, means for us. The Real Presence tells us that *He is with*

s now. *He is always with us.* The Communist wagers upon some object not obtainable today. He will retort justly when criticised for this or for that palpable evil in a communist-run land that Communism has not yet arrived. So far the best he can offer is the dictatorship of the proletariat which in practice has never meant that but, some police State. Never mind: give him the benefit of his sentiments. One day, he will tell you, Communism will arrive, the day when the State withers away though, alas, Lenin did ask, "When has any State withered away?" The question of the "withering away of the State" was asked quite early in the history of 19th-century Communism when the people who really did believe in it, the Anarchists, left the First International. Still, let us be more than just to the Communist. To be fair to him means that we must tell him that he is, after all his sneers at Utopians, a Utopain. He may retort: "I do not wager upon a faith in the invisible but upon concrete facts which must be changed. Every reform achieved, every little demand granted, shows me here and now a little of the reality of my hopes". But the final hope that he has is the deliverance of man, and, whereas I can show him a man delivered, all he can show me is but a few preliminary conditions of a deliverance which is ever deferred — over the rainbow.

The Christian has the Essential

The Christian, however poor in grace and spiritual riches, already has the essential and by that very fact sees himself constrained at least in some little way by a small and faint gleam to help in the transformation of what he now runs counter to his final good and final joy. He knows he is of a body which bears the stains of sin; but he must stand before the world in the name of the faith in the attitude of a permanent revolutionary. He has within him by grace the measure of a perpetual transformation needful wherever his actions may be useful. But the Communist, whatever suffering and anger he may feel (he feels so as a man no doubt rather than as a Communist) the sight of social injustices, by the very fact that he believes that only the interest of man is involved—and of man as he sees him, a collectivity—will see himself fatally

neutralised in his efforts by the gains he may achieve. A concord becomes established between present social interests and the desire to go beyond—to go as far as some final achievement, for that achievement or fullness is never anything but a theoretical future and not a compelling and wholly animating presence.

The pledge of Christian action is not future, but eternal and therefore always a *now*. If in order to save the future of the Church I disobey in the present, I lose all. I crucify Christ and set myself against his glorious return. No Christian opportunism can endure. Indeed St. James was warning early Christians about devotion to *The Future*. "Behold, now you say, Today or tomorrow we will go into a city. . . . Whereas you know not what shall be on the morrow" (James 4, 13, 14).

But by far the greatest evil in this near-veneration for "The Future" is that such preoccupation is an evasion of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus. Have I had to write so much as if St. Paul did not write : "Nunc est praestitutum tempus acceptum. . . . nunc dies salutis" ? (2 Corinthians 6, 2). Nor let any "liberal" think he may go scot free. Indeed, Marxism is spawned from liberalism however much the Communist may rage against the liberal with his nice middle class moderation and his naïve conviction that vote-casting and referenda, together with some mystical dynamism called Progress, will elevate mankind above the old politics where aims demand arms. I am sure I have never advocated the bourgeois scheme of things. I do no more than assert that the last end of the Christian is either present in his conscious acts which have an ascertainable good or it is not. We cannot be spectators. Such passivity allows for connivance. Nor let us be deceived by those who may pat us on the back in some anti-Communist drive by those anxious about their riches.

"Woe betide me if I preach not the Gospel".

Hope in God

Almost by way of a postscript I must write upon the gracious virtue of Hope in God. Alas, like Love, we have downgraded it or thought of it in man-centred terms. When we think of hope in relation to even the most trustworthy

f creatures, we think, as it were, in the subjunctive — rather in a curious subjunctive-future tense. Moreover, English grammar has well nigh lost the subjunctive save in such expressions as “If I were. . . .” Perhaps the loss of the grammatical subjunctive may have to do with our way of looking at Hope as practically a virtue suggesting doubt. God forbid ! Our Hope in God is necessarily a certainty and is necessarily *present* with us. Let me take out the out-of-date *Garden of the Soul* (one of my favourites still thank the good Lord) and read a little of the Act of Hope.

“O my God, nothing is hard or impossible to Thee, because Thy power is infinite : and there is nothing that Thou art not willing to do in favour of us poor mortals, because Thy mercy and goodness for us are infinite. Thou hast made us to Thy own image and likeness and Thou lovest the works of Thy hands; Thou hast redeemed us by the precious Blood of Thy Only Son; and for His sake Thou art *ever* opening Thy hand to pour out Thy graces upon us; never forsaking us, if we forsake not Thee; and still calling upon unhappy sinners that have forsaken Thee; Thou hast promised mercy to such as sincerely seek it; and eternal salvation through Jesus Christ to such as persevere to the end in Thy fear and love. Upon these strong grounds build all my hopes”.

And what does St. Paul write to the Corinthians (2 Cor. 12:19)? “*For all the promises of God in him (The Lord Jesus) are yes and it is*”. It is.

CASSETTE CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

Father Hugh Thwaites, S.J.

The Penny Catechism explained and expanded in a series of 6 cassettes. Price £14 or \$30. Post free from C. V. Productions, 48 Cambridge Rd., Wigmore, Gillingham, Kent, U.K.

Teaching — Then and Now

ELLEN MURRAY

IN recent years the teaching profession has come in for a good deal of stick from both the secular and spiritual world. But the value of the criticisms, some of which are real, is diminished because it overlooks, or chooses to ignore, the first principle: that parents are still the primary and foremost educators of their children and always will be despite the economic pressures put upon them. Of their many duties they, the parents, must prepare children for the often frightening experience of that first day at school which inserts them into a community life that is intended, in its turn, to help mould them into good citizens ready to take their place in a tough and competitive world.

Having said this, we must go back some years to the time when new methods of teaching were being advocated by the pundits on high, who now must accept much of the blame for the apparent illiteracy said to exist amongst present-day school children. Many pupils are leaving school, they say, totally lacking in the basic skills. Of the novelties advanced, none was more favoured than that which stressed the child's own personal freedom of expression and choice of subject to be studied at any given time. A few adventurous schools, attracted by this new approach (or perhaps from less worthy motives which sought the bubble reputation of popularity) surrendered to the alien cry with disastrous results. Soon they were to discover that not only had they succeeded in slowing down the process of learning, but by destroying all respect for authority had contributed to the concomitant evils of intractability and violence with which we are plagued.

When the new methods were introduced, the first of the old to be guillotined was the teaching by rota such things as Tables, Spelling, etc. Grammar and Syntax, too, were considered no longer important: what was important was

children be given encouragement and scope for uninhibited self-expression in their written work, the teacher bringing errors, omissions and presentation. Although some have found it difficult to adapt to this new way of teaching, they soldiered on determined, come what may, in the belief that there were certain things in all subjects that had to be learned by rote, i.e. parrot-fashion, whether or not the children understood the reason or meaning for doing so.

Inevitably, the new thinking spilled over into the Catholic school and the R.E. lesson. Here emphasis was placed on the verbal. Free discussion of the Faith by the children was to proceed unaided by any interference from the teacher who was present only to preside, and not to take part in, lest she be accused of indoctrinating the children with her own beliefs! The "neo-theologians" of the 1960s (and some still linger on) also declared the *Penny Catechism* redundant — some would say anathema. No longer was it to be regarded as the gateway to knowing the Faith. The charge laid against teachers in Catholic schools was that the children were being taught to learn the catechism by rote and without explanation, so that they grew up bereft of any understanding of what had been so dutifully taught. And here I must pause, for it has never been explained, as far as I know, how the teacher's own Faith, subjected to the same method, managed to survive the ordeal which enabled her to pass on the torch of the Catholic Faith to the rising generation.

Now, at last, the wheel has come full circle. Already there are signs of a reversal, if not to the old method, which admittedly had its defects, at least to a more radical approach which takes cognisance of the best in both the old and the new. And in this respect, time-honoured methods which have passed the test, must be retained. The catechism, beloved of the laity, is, in one form or another, coming into its own again. The well-known catechism of Fr. F. H. Drinkwater, is an example. Abbreviated, updated and revised, it is genuinely and truly presented in a way that has unfortunately become a misused and much maligned phrase: "the spirit of Vatican II".

The Holy Father is well aware of the widespread confusion and doubt that exist because of "the dangerous

opinions, or those less in accord with sound faith". This is the principal reason why the theme "Catechetics" was chosen for the 1977 Synod of Bishops. In Pope Paul's "Pastoral Renewal and Witness of Faith" (L'Oss. Roman —8.12.77) he reminds the Bishops of Yugoslavia, whom he was addressing, of Pope John's words at the tomb of St. Peter as he opened the Second Vatican Council: "The Ecumenical Council wishes to hand on the whole of Catholic doctrine, not diminished or distorted". (AAS, LIV. 196 p. 791). Pope Paul also warns those who make public the speculations that "truth is open to investigation and to new modes of expression, *but in the same sense and in the same meaning*". (my emphasis.) Later he goes on to say "Catechesis, therefore, especially that of children and youths, takes on so great an importance that nothing can substitute for it". Recalling the ill-conceived and irreverent comic-strip drawings with their accompanying vague and light-hearted instruction—to give but one example of what was circulated as a teaching aid—one can understand and sympathize with the Holy Father's concern when he said ". . . . in this primary matter of catechesis they (the bishops) must see to it that integrity of doctrine be always respected, especially in regard to the methods and teaching aids of this sort of instruction". Still addressing the bishops he again returns to the God-given duty of parents: "You should exhort Catholic parents to be conscious of the principal and primary duty of handing on the inestimable gift of Faith by their witness and the way they raise the children".

This is not to say that the rest of us can opt out of this all-important apostolate. Parents need, and often get the help that Our Lord commanded.

To conclude: let there be no further experimentation until stock has been taken of the results over the past decade, at least. Some may think that too high a price has been, and is still being, paid for the good achieved. But whatever the conclusion reached, we of the Catholic faith, especially teachers, priests and bishops, must uphold and be witness of that faith, remembering that Christ, the greatest Shepherd and Teacher of all, warned constantly of the need for fidelity.

Any Questions

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

How can one make sense of the social dogma that "All men are equal"?

First of all, by refusing to accept that "equality" means "sameness"; and then by going on to claim for every man being the right to be different. Egalitarianism is not only a dismal and stultifying doctrine: it is also false in principle and a denial of human experience.

We are equal in that we have a human nature in common, and, that the rights implicit in our nature—to life, to dignity, livelihood, freedom, etc.—belong to each one. We are unequal because each of us has a personal version of human nature, and no two versions are alike. We need, therefore, to cultivate both equality and inequality, and to provide for both in any society, from the family to the world. The very terms in which basic rights are stated—as "the preservation of life, and liberty and the pursuit of happiness" of the first draft of the American *Declaration of Independence*—imply that human beings must be allowed to go their own way, each aiming at the perfection of a unique self. Egalitarianism is the denial of equality in the name of equality; and if it were allowed to prevail it would make everybody mad with frustration. Common sense respects it and insists on differences (and "differentials"); but resistance to it needs to be more determined, because egalitarianism is managing to turn greed and envy into virtues, and to make people so discontented with themselves—physical constitution, talents and prospects—that they have not the heart to be the one self they are capable of being.

What truth is there in rumours of plans for a single World State? And do the plans, if they exist, provide for a single World Religion?

Rumours? We have among us many exponents of the ideal, or at least the idea, of One World. However different

their motives, they have the same end in view. Paul VI, in the Encyclical "Populorum Progressio", quoted his own speech to the United Nations Organization: "Who but must see the necessity of arriving by degrees at the establishment of a world-wide authority capable of acting effectively on the juridical and political plane?" Whoever proclaims the One World ideal presents it as the realization of man's noblest aspirations; but it could be the universal slavery of Communism, or the soul-less tyranny of a "Brave New World", or a monstrous bureaucratic manipulating robots. It is not likely to be the heaven-on-earth of a modern Utopia. The kind of unity which is envisaged can be had only at the cost of uniformity, mass produced in appearance and reality, allowing no national cultures, no patriotism, and freedom only to conform. Two leaflets published by "Approaches" (1 Waverley Place Saltcoats, KA21 5AX, Scotland), "Who are the Trilaterals" and "The Mystery of Iniquity", will show you that what you have heard as rumour is more solid and more ominous.

As to the single World Religion, some kinds of ecumenism aim at producing uniformity by destroying belief in fidelity to a lowest common denominator, not loyalty to doctrines. "Ecumenism" is being attempted with Marxism and, for it to succeed, the Church would have to adopt "An Unbeliever's Faith". Read, or reread, Brian Moore's *Catholics*, and pray that it proves to be fantastic and not prophetic.

If the Marks of the Church disappear, does the Church disappear with them? What about Unity?

The answer to the first question is Yes. If the Church were to cease being recognizably the Church of Christ, she would not be genuine. She must therefore continue to be visibly One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. The Faithful would not question that she is Catholic (universal in time, doctrine, and extent), Holy (with the infinite holiness of Christ transmitted to His Mystical Body), and Apostolic (ruled, under Christ, by the successors of Peter and the other Apostles). But is she any longer One, with the unity of divine government, divine faith, and divine worship?

presents to the world a picture of fragmentation; and Catholics themselves no longer know, when they meet strangers called Catholics, if they are united with them in faith, in worship, and under government. Government is seen to be clear and firm, as coming from one Head—once the crazy speculations about a substitute Pope, or a Pope controlled by hypnotism or the administration of drugs. Traditional doctrines are openly denied or are emptied of their substance in new formulations. And worship is a universal field of radical discord. So, where is the faith, and where is the Church?

The Church has one Head, Who is Christ. He governs through His Spirit, Who is always in the Church. The Church's faith is the one faith "deposited" by Christ. And the Church's worship is essentially the one Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, renewed and reenacted in the Mass. Every generation of Catholics has to live up to that inextinguishable unity. What we need today is the prayer from the Mass, said by the priest just before Communion: "Lord, Who didst say to Thy Apostles: I leave peace to you; it is My own peace that I give you: look not on my sins but upon Thy Church's faith, and graciously preserve her peace and unity".

CHRISTIAN ORDER CASSETTES

FATHER PAUL CRANE, S.J.

Supplier: C.V. Productions, 48, Cambridge Road, Wigmore, Gillingham, Kent, U.K. Phone Medway (0634-33168).

Communism and the Catholic Church"

Father Crane's opposition to Communism, which has been long, does not imply any support for the depredations of monopoly capitalism or the increasingly permissive and secular society of the materialistic West. His purpose in this cassette is to trace the faulty thinking, which has been let loose within the Church since Vatican II and which has transformed so radically the one-time sturdy and feared opponent of Communism into its faltering ally. 2 Cassettes: £4.20 or \$9.50 (post-free).

Book Review

CHANGE BY INTERPRETATION?

Pope John's Council by Michael Davies, 1977; £2.75 (post free); Augustine Publishing Company, South View, Chawleigh, Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL.

"The Liberals in the Council will win in the end" reported the *Church Times* Special Correspondent in Rome in November, 1964¹. And many are of the opinion that the Liberals *did* win, Michael Davies' fascinating book being an explanation of the tactics they employed and the particular success they achieved. It may be true that Vatican II was a *Pastoral* rather than a *Dogmatic* Council, and that any statements relating to doctrine are to be interpreted in the light of the pronouncements of previous Councils. That is the conservative case, but it is very far from the position adopted by the Liberals. Wherever the Vatican II texts are ambiguous, then the liberalising interpretation is to be preferred and exploited to the full. In this way real change can be made even in fundamental doctrine.

When the Anglicans asked the Methodists to adopt episcopacy it was thought only reasonable that Free Churchmen should be free to accept any of the interpretations of episcopacy currently held within the Church of England. Anglicans interested in closer relations with the Roman Catholic Church may perhaps ask, not unfairly, whether they are not entitled to adopt any of the interpretations of dogma now tolerated in the Church of Rome!

The most significant of the ambiguities, real or alleged in the documents of Vatican II, is the statement in the Constitution on the Church that the Church of Christ now "subsists" in the Roman Catholic Church. Fr. Avery Dulles S.J., has commented:

"Vatican II rejected a text that would have equated the Church of Christ exclusively with Rome Catholicism and substituted a statement that the Church of Christ now subsists (that is, 'continues to exist') in the Roman Catholic Church.

"The reason for this change", he writes, "was ecclesiological: to give due recognition to the ecclesial value

of other Christian communities. As a result of this change in wording, it is no longer proper for Catholics to think and act as though the Roman Catholic Church, and it alone, were the one, holy, catholic and apostolic church . . . ”²

The Dulles understanding of the matter is shared by not, if not all, non-Catholics, including Dr. H. R. McAdoo (formerly Anglican co-chairman of the A.R.C.I.C.)³, and could be supported from the writings of other Roman Catholic theologians. On the other hand, the Conservatives could counter that, in the language of St. Thomas, those beings exist that do not exist in something else, but exist in themselves, and that their interpretation was upheld by the Vatican document “*Mysterium Ecclesiae*” as recently as 1963⁴. In view of its absolutely *crucial* importance, the Roman Catholic authorities should leave no doubt whatsoever as to the precise meaning of this text. Where doubt clearly exists it should be dispelled at once in the interests of charity, integrity, and the avoidance of that “false ecumenism” against which Davies most convincingly warns. Just suppose that Rome *were* recognising other bodies as Churches. Then which of the Councils of the Church would be generally accepted as Ecumenical (as opposed to the Ecumenical Conferences of the R.C. Church)? What would be the status of Vatican I which promulgated the dogma of Papal Infallibility? This dogma is notoriously difficult for non-Roman Catholics to accept, and there is considerable difference of opinion (even among Roman Catholics) as to how it is to be understood (Does the Pope “*do no more than express the mind of the Church on issues concerning the divine revelation?*”⁵ Then *what* Church?), and so precisely how often the charisma of infallibility has been exercised. Some would restrict its operation to the Christian Dogmas which some Roman Catholic theologians are now trying to exclude from the category of truths, necessary for salvation, or to reduce to some lowly place in a hierarchy of truths” in the “spirit” of Vatican II! But leaving aside Papal infallibility, what of the infallibility of the *Church*? Here again, everything depends upon what is meant by *the Church*!

The Conservatives will argue that freedom of conscience upheld by Vatican II has been misinterpreted and grossly

abused by many Roman Catholics. Perhaps so, but the deviationists have not been disciplined and have established followings (how large I will not argue). Given enough time they will have established themselves and their attitude within the Roman Catholic Church and short of (what may appear to be) schism it will be impossible to dislodge them. History shows that interpretations of doctrine are often "squared" to suit existing conditions, though this is, of course, seldom admitted at the time.

In his book, Michael Davies exposes the great influence of the *periti* or theological experts, upon the Council Fathers. Maybe therein may be discerned the beginning of a movement (then unconscious) by theologians to challenge the authority and responsibility of the bishops, guardians of the Faith. For example, *The Wanderer* (U.S.A.) reported: "While granting that bishops are sincerely interested in the truth, Dulles (Fr. Avery Dulles, S.J.) exudes an intellectual contempt for their mental ability, and concludes that 'their criteria of truth . . . differ from those of many of the more productive scholars. . . . Dulles is obsessed with the idea that theologians must at least on a par with the Pope and Bishops in determining Catholic moral truths'"⁶.

Davies, quoting Bishop Graber of Regensburg, gives a grim warning of what the enemies of the Church may be planning—"the integration of all financial and social forces under a world government in which: 'Catholicism like all religions would consequently be absorbed into a universal syncretism'". In the light of some of the activities of the Club of Rome, and the current onslaught by neo-modern theologians upon Christianity's exclusive claims for its Founder, this may not seem too fanciful.

Francis D. Moss.

NOTES

1. *Church Times*, 27 November, 1964.
2. *The Wanderer*, 24 June, 1976.
3. *New Divinity*, November, 1970.
4. Though Fr. Avery Dulles, S.J., states that *Mysterium Ecclesiae* "recognizes the historically conditioned character of dogmatic pronouncements and calls attention to the need of updating them according to the exigencies of times" (*A Pope for all Christians*, SPCK 1977, p. 51).
5. *Authority in the Church* (The Agreed Statement of the ARCIC, Venice 1977).
6. *National Catholic Weekly*, U.S.A., 24 June, 1976.
Note—Only one bishop was appointed to the Doctrine Commission of the Church of England which reported in 1976, Montefiore (a Suffragan) who had declared: "The idea of Jesus being perfect in every way is an unscriptural doctrine" (CEN, 1 May, 1970).